

**ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED**

270 Mosheim M851
Institutes of eccle- v.1
siastical hist.anc.& 1868930
modern

STORAGE

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT. WAYNE AND ALLEN COUNTY, IND.

DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS FROM POCKET

STO

**ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED**



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-EMD-247

INSTITUTES

OF

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,

ANCIENT AND MODERN,

BY

JOHN LAURENCE VON MOSHEIM, D.D.

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GOTTINGEN.

V. 1

A NEW AND LITERAL TRANSLATION

FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN, WITH COPIOUS ADDITIONAL NOTES,

ORIGINAL AND SELECTED,

BY

JAMES MURDOCK, D.D.

EDITED, WITH ADDITIONS, BY

HENRY SOAMES, M.A.

RECTOR OF STAPLEFORD TAWNEY, WITH THOYDON MOUNT, ESSEX.

A New and Revised Edition.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. I.—PRIMITIVE PERIOD.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS; HATCHARD AND SON; F. AND J. RIVINGTON; HAMILTON AND CO.; WHITTAKER AND CO.; SIMPKIN AND CO.; COWIE AND CO.; T. BUMPUS; BAGSTER AND SONS; J. BAIN; J. DOWDING; T. AND W. BOONE; CAPES AND CO.; J. BIGG AND SON; E. HODGSON; H. G. BOHN; HOULSTON AND CO.; H. WASHBOURNE; SMITH, ELDER, AND CO.; J. NISBET AND CO.; STEVENS AND CO.; W. J. CLEAVER; W. WHITE; G. WILLIS; J. SNOW; G. ROUTLEDGE; BICKERS AND CO.; J. CHIDLEY; AND J. H. PARKER, OXFORD.

1845.

THE
NEWBERRY

1868930

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,
ANCIENT AND MODERN.

VOL. I.

LONDON :
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

TO
SIR EDWARD BOWYER SMYTH,
OF HILL HALL, ESSEX, BARONET,
WHOSE RELIGIOUS HABITS,
ANXIETY FOR THE SPIRITUAL WELFARE
OF ALL WITHIN HIS INFLUENCE,
DUE SENSE OF OBLIGATION AS AN ECCLESIASTICAL PATRON,
AND PATRICIAN LIBERALITY,
CAST A LUSTRE UPON AN ANCIENT FAMILY,
AND DISPLAY THE VALUE OF AN HEREDITARY ARISTOCRACY,
THIS EDITION OF MOSHEIM'S INSTITUTES
IS GRATEFULLY AND AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED.

SCOTT'S PATENT,
JANUARY 4, 1811.

THE

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

THE latitudinarian and infidel habits which ranged with unusual boldness over most of the eighteenth century, and gained a perfect mastery over France about its close, have now been stopped in their pernicious course by a decided reaction. It is true, that no one any longer advocates intolerance, and that legal restraints upon liberty of conscience are very generally abandoned. But it is equally true that public opinion has not forsaken the narrow maxims of an earlier day from the prevalence of a shallow, supercilious contempt for all religions, as alike undeserving of notice from enlightened minds. On the contrary, religious questions are among those which most extensively engage a liberal curiosity. Nor is there any department of them more generally cultivated than the historical. Men are become fully aware, that the *history* of religion must be known by all who would understand its doctrines critically, or estimate its bearing upon passing events with sufficient accuracy. Hence works upon this branch of learning have recently appeared with unwonted profusion. Numerous contributions of considerable value have been made to the stock of ecclesiastical biography, and many able authors have illustrated the histories of insulated churches and periods. Thus

much interesting and important information, of this practical and solid kind, has been generally diffused, producing, among other wholesome fruits, an appetite for more extensive acquisitions of the same description.

But although particular branches of ecclesiastical history have severally their peculiar claims upon the attention of certain communities and individuals, a general knowledge of the whole subject is also plainly indispensable. This has long been chiefly sought in England, from Mosheim. His great work is known for a degree of research and impartiality which cannot be found in any similar publication of the same size. Yet it has never been very popular. Most English readers of such books have consulted and applauded it: very few have turned from its pages without regretting that so much valuable matter is not to be found in some more attractive form. Such regret might seem to have arisen from three causes: the author's arrangement, his deficiencies in British ecclesiastical history, and objections to his translator, Dr. Maclaine. The first of these is irremediable, unless the *Institutes* were wholly re-cast; unless, therefore, a new work were written, embodying the labours of Dr. Mosheim. Even in case, however, of entering upon such a task, it might admit of serious doubt, whether Mosheim's arrangement could be much improved in an ecclesiastical history meant chiefly to aid a scholar in research, or supply occasional information. For the mere purpose of continuous reading, unquestionably such a distribution of the narrative is injudicious. But as the author thought principally of supplying students with references, and a general view of the subject, he has arranged his materials with sufficient skill for such purposes. Reference, however, is the end for which his work will ever be most used. It is a compilation which will not often be read regularly through more than once, but which any clergyman, or other person, able to appreciate historical knowledge, would gladly store among his books, and would be likely to consult habitually. A much more serious objection to English readers of Mosheim, has been his insufficient informa-

tion upon all subjects of national interest. Many particulars that he supplies upon the later history of Lutheranism, and other continental systems of religion, have no great interest for a native of the British isles. But such a reader cannot fail of disappointment when he sees little upon matters that most concern himself. He does not wish to feel constantly that his author was a German Lutheran, calculating upon readers chiefly among his own countrymen, and the holders of his own religious opinions. Nothing is more desirable than such a direction of the writer's thoughts, when he is detailing the first steps of the Reformation; because these concern religious history generally, and are highly interesting to Englishmen in particular, from the part which their country took so early in the glorious struggle for emancipation from Rome. Nor, probably, is a native of Britain so well calculated for tracing Luther's progress, as one of that illustrious reformer's own countrymen. But when the continental stages of the Reformation have been related with sufficient fulness, the English reader naturally looks for a corresponding degree of information upon the religious affairs of his own country. He may, indeed, be aware, that such a knowledge of his national ecclesiastical history as becomes a native, and is necessary for a due acquaintance with domestic questions, is not to be acquired from a comprehensive work of no great extent, like Mosheim's. He is, however, fully justified in expecting to see a compilation generally consulted by his countrymen upon ecclesiastical history, as full upon British branches of it, as it is upon German. For its palpable deficiencies here, the author, undoubtedly, is by no means chargeable, as he could never have thought himself likely, even in his most sanguine moments, to become the principal authority upon ecclesiastical history among Englishmen, and to retain that proud position during many years. Such has, however, proved his enviable fortune, and he may long retain possession of the ground so honourably won. His excellences are undisputed and indisputable; and the difficulties of superseding his labours by a new summary with equal claims to confidence, are

such as readers who have never tried or witnessed historical composition little suspect. To say nothing of the requisite ability, an undertaking of that kind would make demands of time and money that very few scholars are able to answer. An English compiler, too, would find it very difficult to escape from a party bias, and scarcely possible to rise above the depreciation which would infallibly assail him from the various parties which he had disobliged either by censure, neglect, or neutrality. When Dr. Maclaine, therefore, discerned an opening for his industry, in the national want of a good ecclesiastical history, he was perfectly right in supplying it by the very able work of a learned foreign protestant. He thus kept clear of the suspicion which party spirit was pretty sure to fasten upon any similar undertaking from a native, and of that which the great majority of Englishmen reasonably entertain against historical statements prepared under any degree of Romish prejudice. He saw, however, the deficiencies of Mosheim upon all British questions, and accordingly wrote many valuable notes to supply them. Still the work, although deservedly welcomed by the public, did not bear a character sufficiently English for the country. Members of the national church very naturally complained that Maclaine, as might be expected from his presbyterian opinions, had been very far from doing it justice. Every English reader was struck with the meagre notice that his own country received, after all the translator's additions. The history remained essentially German. It might be well enough that its pages should continue to offer all the information supplied by Mosheim upon his own country. This could not fail of being found occasionally useful, and even interesting. But then a like quantity of information was fairly required as to domestic affairs. Now this, Dr. Maclaine had been very far from supplying; nor has the new translator made up for his deficiencies in this respect. When, therefore, the care of this edition was undertaken, the Editor considered his attention most needed to render the work more useful in the British isles. Mere notes were thought insufficient: whole chapters appeared necessary;

and more of these were written, at greater lengths too, than were at first intended. They do not relate, however, only to England : Scotland and Ireland have also some separate chapters. By this mass of new and original matter, (of itself sufficient to form an octavo volume of moderate size,) a new character has been given to this edition of Mosheim. It is not, as former editions were, a work essentially German, with a tinge of Scottish presbyterianism : domestic religious history occupies as much space as foreign. It may even occupy more than any single section of foreign history. Thus, unquestionably, the British isles have at length offered to their notice an ecclesiastical history, comprehensive, though not superficial, and arranged with especial reference to their own use. Of course, these large additions will cross the views of many readers. The Editor appears before the world as a clergyman beneficed in the Church of England, and he would be very sorry to act in any degree, as if his convictions did not coincide with his interests. But although he is the first person of the Anglican communion connected with this long-established work, he has left his predecessors in possession of all their old ground. The Church of England has displaced nothing. She has only, for the first time, occupied that space among Mosheim's labours, to which her importance fairly entitles her. Thus the whole work really has less of a party character than before. It may now be considered as an aggregate, in which every great section of protestants is allowed to speak for itself. Objections may be made to the several writers as partizans individually, but no one can deny that they have, in these volumes, a fair chance of correcting and neutralizing each other. It is hoped, also, that whatever may be thought of the new additions, they will at least be considered useful, by giving something of an English appearance to Mosheim's admirable *Institutes*. Thus, the learned German's labours may no longer provoke that complaint of their continental cast, which has been commonly made of them in this country, and with unquestionable justice.

Another objection, much heard in England against this

valuable compilation, has turned upon Dr. Maclaine's translation of it. This, although meritorious upon the whole, has been considered as betraying, in various places, the translator's prejudices against episcopacy, and as generally chargeable with a loose and rhetorical character, that really lowers the excellence of a style which it was meant to raise. Hence it has been often said, 'If we are to have no other ecclesiastical history than Mosheim's, let us, at least, have that better translated.' Such language, it seems, has not been heard only on this side of the Atlantic. The great American section of Britain's noble progeny has used the ecclesiastical history most consulted in the land of its fathers, and has made objections to the dress provided for it by Dr. Maclaine. One of that intelligent, enterprising, and improving nation, has come honourably forward to remove these objections. He is not likely to have disapproved his predecessor as a presbyterian, because it is understood that he is, himself, no member of an episcopal communion. But, in common with scholars generally, he thought his labours injured in their claims both to good taste and confidence, by a needless and suspicious anxiety for ornament. Dr. Murdock has judiciously obviated this objection. His text is in a plain and manly style, more faithful, undoubtedly, to the original than that of Dr. Maclaine.

When first reprinted in England, few or no alterations were contemplated in Dr. Murdock's translation. The Editor, accordingly, did not undertake to compare it, either with the original, or with Dr. Maclaine's version. He could not, indeed, have made such a comparison effective, without giving to his task a much greater length of time than it actually consumed. Yet this proved far greater than was anticipated. When the work, however, came before the world, many readers regretted that the translation had not been revised. Various inaccuracies and improprieties were detected in it, which were justly thought to detract from its value. It was, therefore, determined, when the first English edition was exhausted, to revise Dr. Murdock's translation before it should be reprinted. In the present im-

pression this is done. The whole translation has been compared with the original, and innumerable alterations have been made in it, both as to style and matter. Of course, the work, after all, will not present the uniform aspect which belongs to the labours of a single hand. But it is hoped that no material error has escaped correction, and that Mosheim's language is much more closely represented in English, than it had been upon former occasions. The Editor's additional chapters and tables are distinguished by an asterisk; his notes are marked [*Ed.*]. Dr. Murdock's notes are almost entirely untouched.

In addition to his notes, Dr. Murdock has incorporated the substance of Cave's *Historia Literaria*. As Mosheim intended only to produce a summary of ecclesiastical history, that might guide students into more extensive acquisitions, he contented himself with mentioning the principal authors in each century. His work has, however, become the sole source of information consulted by a large number of readers upon the affairs of the church generally. This may be lamented, inasmuch as a work of such dimensions, though not of the light and unsatisfactory character that has latterly been so popular, must, after all, be very much of an abridgment, when it relates to such a long series of ages. But the misfortune is past remedy in most cases. None but students will even consult, except on rare occasions, very voluminous collections, and such literary appliances are so expensive as even to come within the reach of but few who value books. The great majority of readers must ever, therefore, rest contented with a learned work like Mosheim's, comprehensive, yet reasonably full. But it is obvious that a prevailing disposition to seek information upon the wide range of religious affairs, within a compass so limited, renders it of great importance to crowd as much as possible into the allotted space. Hence Dr. Murdock made a great improvement to his work, as a manual of ecclesiastical history, by completing Mosheim's imperfect catalogues of ecclesiastical writers, from the invaluable labours of Cave. Few of his readers, comparatively, would be found to possess the *Historia Literaria*, or any simi-

lar work of corresponding importance; yet without some acquaintance with the general mass of information accumulated in the best books of that class, a most imperfect estimate will be formed of the theological knowledge possessed by the church during the several stages of her existence.

The American edition of this work is in three volumes, but the English publishers at once decided upon four, and the great extent of new matter has rendered such a decision necessary. Yet of this large addition little or nothing is really superfluous. Objectors are not likely to maintain that its quantity is greater than the British isles require for a sufficient appearance of their own affairs, even in a comprehensive body of general ecclesiastical history, unless it be also professedly superficial. In distributing the whole mass of information over four volumes, the Editor used his own discretion. It seemed of more importance to render each volume complete in itself by comprising a definite portion of the subject, than to consult merely, or even principally, for its symmetrical appearance by the side of the others. This arrangement, like any other, is immaterial to those who may take the book down for occasional reference; but it may be found useful to those who are regularly reading it. Such individuals, by considering each division of the subject in succession, by itself, will more conveniently gain a knowledge of the whole. Now ecclesiastical history admits of an advantageous division into four portions: it may be considered as *primitive*, *medieval*, that relating to the *Reformation*, or *modern*. The first five centuries have long been formed into one series, invested with a distinctive character. This period has, in strict accuracy, however, three divisions, parted from each other by features of their own. The first is that simple age, when the apostles, and those who conversed with them, ordinarily called *apostolic men*, lived upon the earth. The second is the age which gave philosophy an entrance into the church. The third begins with Constantine, and exhibits the Roman empire as a community of Christians, but retaining many marks of the Paganism lately overthrown. Of these

three divisions the first is obscure, from the scantiness of its literary monuments, and the second glides almost imperceptibly into the third. It has, therefore, been far from unusual to make citations from the first five centuries as from one definite era. They saw the church's birth and infancy, her struggles through persecution to a civil establishment; the summit and decline of imperial Rome, the transfer of its remaining importance to Constantinople, and the foundation of monarchies entirely new in western Europe. Thus these five centuries really have a considerable uniformity of aspect; and they contain the germs of nearly all the religious movements that were unfolded subsequently. To their termination, accordingly, the *primitive* church is usually extended, but beyond them, perhaps, never. They may, therefore, be conveniently considered as comprising the whole *primitive* period, and under that view their history has been included in the first volume of the present work.

In the sixth century opens a course of events with different characteristics. Rome, long abandoned by the imperial family, was daily dwindling in importance, and its powerful, wealthy bishop grew imperceptibly into the principal inhabitant. Paganism appeared extinct in all the best parts of Europe, having yielded partly to persecution, partly to a compromise with Christianity. Sovereigncies of northern origin were seating themselves firmly through the west. The learning and civilization of classical times retained but a feeble hold even upon Italy: beyond the Alps there was only here and there a mind enlightened by a glimmering from them. As times rolled on, these causes changed the face of all western Europe. The Roman bishop became a temporal prince. Religion exhibited a motley face, of which the most prominent and popular features were akin to Paganism. The west became occupied by separate nations, distinguished from each other by laws, languages, and institutions, no less than by localities. The darkness of illiteracy gradually thickened, until it reached its height in the tenth century. The Roman see, though its occupants in that century sank to the lowest ebb of personal discredit, was con-

tinually on the advance as to importance. It supplied headquarters both for lingering civilization, and for popular superstition. It afforded also, from the superior ability of its canonists, those facilities for a satisfactory reference, which were hopeless in any other quarter of the west. Another of its holds upon the public mind arose from the power which it possessed, and used, of curbing the selfish despotism of feudal sovereignty. Thus an immense influence was gradually acquired, which popes and their advocates represented as an indefeasible right of the Roman see, having been conferred upon it from above for the benefit of mankind. Such were the causes in operation during the five centuries which preceded the millenary year, and they acted powerfully upon that intellectual re-action which then began. Scholars now arose once more in greater numbers than had latterly been usual; but instead of going boldly to the fountain-heads of knowledge, they timidly sought to systematize the principles that they found on the surface of society. Hence the scholastics rendered but little service, in proportion to their numbers and industry, to the cause of sound learning; but the obligations are immense that they laid upon the papacy and upon the peculiar system of religion with which it had identified itself. They formed a solid fortification about both, which never was effectually shaken until the revival of an earlier literature, aided by the invention of printing, in the fifteenth century, opened a new era. Thus the whole period from the termination of the fifth century to the beginning of the fifteenth has an unbroken character of its own. It may be called the *medieval* period, and its history has been comprised in the second volume. To that volume, therefore, must readers chiefly turn who would understand sufficiently the rise, progress, ascendancy, and incipient decline of the papal system.

The third volume details the history of that remarkable reaction which Romish abuse of prosperity at length provoked. For this the whole fourteenth century had really been storing up preparations; but, although it produced Wickliffe, popular

attention fixed rather upon assumptions of the papal see, than upon religious principles. This prevailing impatience of pontifical power gave it an irrecoverable shock in the earlier part of the fifteenth century, and introduced a general opinion, that ecclesiastical questions of paramount importance required a general council for their due authentication. Hence, when classical knowledge revived, and printing gave literature facilities for circulation hitherto unknown, the public mind was rapidly prepared for suspecting an insufficiency of proof in many articles of the established creed. Way was thus made for Luther, Zuingli, and others of the reformers, by whom the religious aspect of Europe was permanently altered in the sixteenth century. Towards the close of that age, the progress of these new opinions was arrested, chiefly by the civil power, in various countries, but partly also by the authentication given at Trent to the disputed doctrines, and by theological exertions to mould them into a defensible, consistent system. Thus the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries form a peculiar period, which may fitly be designated as that of the *Reformation*, in them being included the chief preliminaries of that important revolution, its various steps, and the degree of success that crowned the exertions of its opponents.

The fourth volume has been devoted to the *modern* period, or that from the year 1600 downwards to the present time. This whole period exhibits the west permanently and distinctly divided into Romish and protestant countries. It shows, in its earlier portion, the struggles of the papal party to regain its lost ascendancy, and the ill success that generally attended them. Hence arose, on both sides, a discreditable display of intolerance, and this again declined as the two parties found it answer the ends of neither. On its decline was reared a spirit of latitudinarianism and infidelity, which in its turn has latterly yielded to a decided religious re-action. Thus the whole 245 years last past have a connected character of their own, and their history may be advantageously considered by itself.

To the first or *primitive* period, especially to its earliest

years, all religious parties of the present time appeal: the combined scantiness and obscurity of its records being favourable to uses of them under very different views. As the period, however, advances, means of estimating it accumulate, and from its history may be safely drawn some inferences of lasting practical importance. One of these relates to the religion that Christianity superseded. It is the ordinary belief that paganism was merely a wild polytheism, invented by artful priests, and embellished by imaginative poets, but without a single hold upon superior minds beyond a fear of rash innovation, and a desire to keep the vulgar in subjection. The first five centuries of the Christian era, however, exhibit the heathen system under a stronger, and, it may be added, a healthier tenacity. Many men of high attainments, and it would be uncharitable to doubt, of unsuspected morals, are found among the defenders of ancient religious prepossessions. If these, however, had offered nothing better than such legendary tales as give life to the enchanting pages of Greek and Roman poetry, it is not very likely that estimable men in their serious moments would have stood forward so pertinaciously in their defence, when once their incapacity to bear examination had been thoroughly exposed. But the truth is, that genuine polytheism never existed except in vulgar misapprehension. The diversified heathen gods have always been considered by the better informed of their worshippers as no other than powerful mediators, who might be discreetly and advantageously used in making approaches to one Great Supreme¹. This fact explains

¹ This view is illustrated by the following very remarkable passage from some lost play of Sophocles, preserved by Justin and others of the fathers :—

Εἰς ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν, εἰς ἑστὶ Θεός,
 "Ὅς οὐρανὸν τέτυχε, καὶ γαῖαν μακρὰν,
 Πόντον τε χαροπὸν οὐδμα, κἀνέμων βίας.
 Θνητοὶ δὲ πολλοὶ καρδίᾳ πλανώμενοι,
 Ἰδρυσάμεθα πημάτων παραψυχὴν,
 Θεῶν ἀγάλματ' ἐκ λίθων τε καὶ ξύλων,
 Ἡ χρυσοτέκτων, ἡ ἐλεφαντίνων τέπνουσ'.

Θυσίας τε τοῦτοις καὶ καλὰς πανηγύρεις
 Τεύχοντες, οὕτως εἰσεβῆιν νομίζομεν.

S. Just. Mart. *ad Græcos Cohort.*
 p. 18, Par. 1636.

These lines may, perhaps, be thus translated :—

There is, in truth, but One, a single God,
 Who heav'n created, and wide-spreading
 earth,
 Sea's azure swell, and furious winds.

the resistance of heathen philosophers to Christian teachers, without any of those harsh judgments of individuals, which are commonly no less unsound than uncharitable. It also explains that proneness to idolatry which was remarkable among the ancient Jews. If the opposition between the two systems be viewed in the light thrown by later ages from the controversy between protestantism and popery, sufficient reason will be seen at once for the tenacity of that which later times have acknowledged with one voice as immeasurably the weaker.

Ecclesiastical history shows that philosophic resistance to Christianity was overcome by a sort of compromise. It was clearly proved by the Christian apologists, that no objection could be reasonably urged against the new system from its foundation upon the unity of God, by any well-informed pagan. As this indisputable fact became more widely understood, the moral teaching of the two systems was placed in juxta-position, and nothing more was thought necessary for a perfect agreement between moderate men than a few mutual concessions of no vital importance. From this compromise, however, have arisen some of the gravest questions that a student of ecclesiastical history has to consider. If men would stop exactly where their leaders mean them, it might have been judicious for a time to supersede pagan holidays by Christian, to regale the senses of half-converted worshippers by the lustral water, odoriferous incense, ornamental statuary, and gaudy ceremonies to which they had been accustomed. Romanists, indeed, maintain, that when these concessions were made to pagan pre-

*But we, the mortal crowd, with erring heart,
Set up as consecrations for our woes
Statues of gods in stones and blocks of wood,
Or figures wrought in gold or ivory.
These have their victims and gay holidays,
Praise, in our own conceits, of piety.*

"Some may think it improbable that Sophocles should venture to attack the gods, and the religious ceremonies of his own country, in so open a manner :

but these verses are not like those of the Sibyl, in the style of the Scriptures, and it is certain that in the Greek comedies and tragedies there are many bold strokes against the fabulous and popular religion." (Jortin, *Remarks on Eccl. Hist.* i. 206, Lond. 1767.) The truth is, that Sophocles here only wrote what all the wiser of his countrymen acknowledged.

possessions, the Christian world really *did* stop at the proper point. But this is debateable ground, and even if Romish advocates could successfully defend it, the rise of Mahometanism upon the pagan form taken by Christianity, would be a powerful reason for doubting the propriety of that compromise which the church had made: certainly, of her tenacity in maintaining it. Besides, there is reason for believing that heathen externals have affected Gospel truths, even in superior minds. Every one who has read the sixth book of Virgil's *Æneid* with any degree of attention, is at no loss to see that a belief in purgatory, like the religious use of images, is older than Christianity². The latter is known to have been adopted from paganism: it may be well to consider whether such is not likely to be the fact as to the former also: and purgatory forms a pivot upon which the Romish system very largely turns. The chief point in that system is not, however, directly traceable to heathenism. Transubstantiation, which makes Romanists look upon their communion-service, under the ancient name of *mass*, as a mysterious sacrifice, beneficial both to dead and living, can be connected by no glowing lines with classical antiquity. But it may admit of reasonable doubt, whether such a doctrine could ever have made its way among Christians, and more still, whether it could have gradually surrounded itself by the numerous observances grown out of it, unless a pagan cast of thought had been deeply rooted in the Christian mind.

Other questions deserving notice from a student of *primitive* ecclesiastical history, turn upon religious persecution. It is not uncommon to hear people talk in these days, as if penal restrictions upon liberty of conscience were especially a papal crime, of which, undoubtedly, protestants must share the infamy, but only because their prejudices had been reared in the sanguinary school of Rome. It is also common to hear religious intolerance branded as quite upon a level, both as to

² Virg. *Æn.* vi. 735.

guilt and folly, being powerless to suppress an adverse creed. The earlier pages of religious history, however, trace persecution to the emperor Theodosius, when the Roman see was nothing more than the first bishopric in his empire, or equal with the first; and when the system now embodied in the creed of pope Pius IV. could be found connected nowhere, nor even many traces of it, among Christians of information, however unconnected. The truth is, therefore, that religious intolerance originated in imperial, not in papal Rome, and it completely succeeded. Paganism vanished, or at the very least denied its name, and admitted an immense infusion from its rival, under the withering energy of penal laws. The only problem for solution here is, whether the old system might not have defied even such extinction as it underwent, if the new, instead of meeting it half way, had insisted upon an unqualified surrender. With respect to the persecution of later times, it is known to have succeeded completely in the Spanish Peninsula, and all but completely in Italy. In other parts of Europe, indeed, its success has rarely been complete. But these, although disgraced by a great deal of cruel legislation, and often by seeing it carried into practice, have rarely holden long one unvarying course of intolerance. In these islands, especially, the worst statutes were no sooner passed than they were systematically evaded. Thus, although individuals were crushed, the body never was: it was only kept in a feverish state of irritation and alarm, with resources carefully husbanded for the first occasion when they could be used with vigour.

In the Donatistic schism will be recognised a primitive example of those exclusive and severe views of discipline, which have since been repeatedly revived, under various names, by different parties in the Christian world. No allowance was to be made for a lapse into the infirmity of delivering up sacred books to heathen magistrates during the hottest fire of a raging persecution: none, for the slightest deviation from a standard of moral perfection framed in the most narrow and rigid spirit. Had, indeed, such principles been laid down by

a strict self-denying party, solely for its own guidance, other Christians would have had no cause for complaint. But it is an instructive fact to be gleaned from this appearance of a severe party in the primitive church, that such bodies are not likely to rest contented with the regulation of themselves. The purity of their motives, and the reality of individual sacrifices, may be above suspicion, as they generally have been, but the proud and angry feelings of man enter imperceptibly into most of his reasonings. The Donatist, accordingly, could see nothing better than a spurious Christianity in any one who declined his own unbending rule of duty. A profession, branded with such laxity, was thought enough to invalidate the sacraments, and the commission that administered them. Recruits for the party were, indeed, welcomed, but they must be re-baptized, and if ministers, re-ordained. It is thus that men vent an exclusive, domineering, uncharitable spirit. Undoubtedly, the occasional popularity of parties with Donatistic notions of propriety, has a tendency to preserve the general standard of religious profession from descending too low. But this rather comes from the care of Providence to bring good out of evil, than from any exercise of sound wisdom in the parties themselves. The complete success of such a body as the Donatists, could hardly fail of driving the majority of men into open irreligion, and into charges of downright hypocrisy upon the religious minority, founded upon a searching and malignant observation of its liability to man's more decent weaknesses.

It is, however, true, that severe views of discipline did not originate in Donatism, although it carried them further than the church in general. For scandals brought upon the Christian body, proportionable penances had been immemorially exacted. This was a just and salutary regulation; but it glided insensibly into such abuses as altered the whole face of western Europe. Upon penance was founded a sort of science. Human transgressions were systematically classed, as the *medieval* period commenced, and for each a definite satisfac-

tion was provided. This proved a delusive and injurious branch of learning. Competent skill in it enabled an ecclesiastic to determine at once the penalty which any sinner had to undergo. But he also interpreted his *penitentials* upon the strictest principles of retaliation. Delinquency and penance were to balance each other exactly. This principle quickly drove men upon impossibilities, and the whole system ended, at length, in that which is now established among Romanists, and which has hardly any affinity with primitive penitential doctrines. A Christian might learn, in the earlier ages of the medieval period, that a murder, perhaps, required a penance of ten years. But suppose ten murders had been committed, was the penalty to consume a century? The penitential divine said, Yes, if it should prove possible; and held the same impracticable language upon human iniquities generally³. Thus, in a gross and violent age, great numbers of men were involved in admitted liabilities, which were either wholly out of their power to discharge, or very nearly so. Upon this inability, or extreme difficulty, arose the system of commuting penance. The poor might scourge themselves, or, parrot-like, go through the irksome drudgery of repeating psalms hundreds of times. The rich might build churches, or bridges, or otherwise make public duty trample down individual selfishness. There is no doubt that posterity has been much indebted to the force thus put upon wealth through abuse of the penitential system, but the beneficial operation of such a system so perverted upon the transgressors themselves, is by no means equally clear. When a neighbour saw delinquency so visited, he might, indeed, be deterred from following such a dangerous example. The suffering party might merely feel sore at his want of power to escape the penalty, or he might consider the payment of it as a perfect acquittance that rendered any care of the evil within altogether superfluous.

But when men are driven upon a search for expedients, they

³ Fleury, *apud* Jortin, *Rem. on Ecol. Hist.* v. 127.

rarely fail of finding some entirely to their taste. It was thus with commuted penance. None but gloomy tempers would bear patiently flagellation, or gabbling Latin sentences by the score; none but liberal spirits would cheerfully meet a despotic call for some costly sacrifice. A device, however, was at hand, which penitents of every class, or either sex, generally found rather agreeable than irksome. A natural respect for the tombs of those who had shed their blood in witness to the Gospel, and to the spots which such heroic sacrifices had consecrated, rapidly degenerated, under the infusion of Paganism, into a taste for relics, the most base and stupid of superstitions. To meet a growing demand for such worthless trumpery, the east rapidly became very much upon the alert. Every place could not aspire to the honour of possessing a saint, or martyr's tomb; but some fragment from the body, or its appurtenances, of such a personage, might come within the reach of a very wide circle. Oriental speculators upon European credulity were careful to send away disappointed no customer for superstitious wares. A practice of separating relics⁴ was introduced, which rendered the supply of them quite inexhaustible. Even a cross on which our Saviour was said to have suffered, and which was found by Helena, mother of Constantine, proved an unfathomable mine of wealth. The number of alleged fragments from an object so notorious, and known to be of no great size, could not fail of striking any observer of ordinary sagacity. But people were provided with a solution of the difficulty, quite sufficient for the time, and for habits of thinking formed among the impostures of Pagan priests. The cross was represented as endued with a vitality that kept the original entire, while it regularly supplied a sufficiency of fragments to meet all the demands of purchasers⁵. This account, although positively

⁴ Fleury, *ut supra*, 85.

⁵ "St. Paulinus relates a *very singular thing* concerning that part of the cross which was at Jerusalem. This cross, says he, having a vital virtue in an insensible and inanimate substance,

lath yielded, and continues to yield almost daily, its precious wood to the desires of an infinite number of persons, without suffering any diminution, continuing all the while as if it had been untouched. It permits itself every day

laughable, and like some invention of Voltaire's, was regularly heard with all the gravity that those who kept the cross, and lived by it, could wish. But men were not to be satisfied with the bare possession of such treasures. They panted for the honour of importing them, and for the spiritual benefits which were anticipated from a visit to their original sites. Thus arose pilgrimages, and by these, accounts were agreeably squared with the penitential. A sinner from the west might acknowledge obligations that he could not bear the thought of discharging, either in person or purse. But give him the option of a journey to Rome, or Jerusalem, or some other distant place, instead, and his repugnance would usually vanish. At most periods, human beings are greedy of opportunities to visit strange places, and to meet with adventures. The people, besides, in the earlier years of medieval Europe, were incessantly occupied with either war or hunting. Hence a roving, shifting, unsettled way of life was interwoven with their habits, and very little of a hardship⁶. Thus, when the eighth century introduced a practice of commuting penance by pilgrimage, the church completely followed again the same popular line of policy that had so much made for her temporal interest before, in the compromise with Paganism. But her voice, as a stern asserter of morality, was really stifled. She had once refused a right hand of fellowship to notorious offenders, until they had gone through a course of penitential confinement, under the watchful eye of competent spiritual advisers⁷. She now was contented with prescribing some sanctimonious ramble to a distance, and her voice provoked no resistance. But the spirit of the old system evaporated, and its beneficial operation ceased.

to be divided into several parts, and yet remains exposed entire to the veneration of the people,"—(Tillemont, *apud* Jortin, *Rem. on Eccl. Hist.* ii. 242.) As this matter, though perhaps the most striking of its kind, was only one number of a very numerous family, we cannot wonder at the Mahumedan reaction

in such a country. Those who knew any thing of Judaism, or unadulterated Christianity, might easily make out a strong case for branding a community, given up to such folly and imposture, with downright heathenism.

⁶ Fleury, *apud* Jortin, *ut supra*, 89.

⁷ Fleury, *ut supra*, 434.

Its extinction was owing to the crusades. To set these insane expeditions in motion, *plenary indulgences* were invented at the council of Clermont⁸. People could square their penitential accounts in the completest manner by taking part in the intended conquest of Palestine. This was a new and a most agreeable relaxation of the canonical penances. By these, men had been interdicted from wearing arms, or mounting a horse⁹, while unabsolved; and such prohibitions must have often pressed severely in an age of military activity and violence. The pilgrim of the cross was, however, necessarily a soldier, and his weapons, perhaps a charger too, which otherwise might have lain under a dispiriting sentence of disuse, were emulously prepared for service. Again, no creditor could molest a debtor regularly set apart for the crusade. He must wait for his return, and if this ever took place, he could only demand the principal of his debt; every claim to interest being cancelled by an active participation in wars esteemed so meritorious¹. By this, and other obvious inducements, the immense masses that poured eastwards were easily collected. They were an aggregate of men galled by penitential obligations, reinforced by the fanatical, the restless, the adventurous, the turbulent, the criminal, the dishonest, and the insolvent. Never before was recruiting conducted upon principles of such diversified and extensive popularity. But never were armies made up of worse materials upon the whole, or great expe-

⁸ "To put the people in motion, the grand resort was a *plenary indulgence*, which was then first introduced. The church in all times had left a discretionary power to the bishops to remit part of the canonical penance, according to the fervour of the penitent, and other circumstances; but till now it had never been seen that in favour of one single work, the sinner was discharged from all temporary punishments which were due to the Divine justice. Nothing less than a numerous council, with a pope presiding in person, could

authorize such an alteration in the system of penance."—Fleury, *ut supra*, 397.

⁹ Fleury, *ut supra*, 399.

¹ The crusaders "were under the protection of the church, and secured from the pursuit of their creditors, who could require nothing of them before their return, and even then only the principal, without interest or usury. They were a sort of sacred people: excommunication was inflicted on all who should touch their persons or goods."—Fleury, *ut supra*, 447.

crusades, that St. Bernard and Innocent III. represent it as an especial instance of heavenly mercy, that men, who had hitherto refused penance, were at length willing to undergo it, a way for satisfying the Divine justice less repugnant to their feelings than any anciently known, having been happily discovered³. But the church never could recover her authority over considerable sinners. When the crusades lived only in remembrance, scholastic divinity erected secret confessions and absolutions, termed sacramental, into a system that made individual clergymen more powerful than ever, at the same time that it superseded that check upon iniquity which their order collectively had possessed in former times.

But although the moral operation of this new system obviously lays it open to the gravest objections, it has those charms for man that make him slow in scrutinizing its pretensions. Rome accordingly received her first blows through the papacy itself. Europe was prepared for *the Reformation* by impatience of papal assumptions. Hence arose assertions of a paramount authority in general councils, and those inquiries into the records produced by pontifical advocates, which ended in the explosion of Constantine's donation as a fable, and of the decretals as forgeries. This boldness of investigation, which ranged over most of the fifteenth century, aided by a prevailing disposition to disparage all literature but classical, cut away the ground to an unknown extent from the Church of Rome. Thus when her penitential doctrines, in the following century, awakened Luther's jealous inquiries, men were prepared for abandoning them, as upon a par with Constantine's donation, or other points yet unquestioned, because unexamined. It was, indeed, easy to throw suspicion upon almost any article in the popular creed. The whole system had grown up in ages branded with barbarism, and convicted of extreme credulity. A formal authentication, therefore, of

³ "They pathetically extol the mercy of God, who, in these days, had given men an opportunity of being converted, and a new method of satisfying the Divine justice."—Fleury, *ut supra*, 432.

all the doctrines which could offer no firm support from Scripture and primitive antiquity, became necessary for preserving the Latin church in her actual condition. This indispensable service was rendered by the council of Trent; but moderate men, even among Romanists, must occasionally consider it a service of rather doubtful value. By curtailing boldly the points hitherto open to latitude of opinion, and affirming as Catholic verities many positions that no scholar could prove such, the Trentine council really divided Europe permanently into two distinctly-marked religious parties. For any peaceful purpose it wholly failed. But undoubtedly it staved off extinction from the semi-Paganism of papal Rome. The rent already made was prevented from spreading, and even partially repaired⁴.

Romanists attribute their good fortune in accomplishing these objects, entirely to the difficulty, approaching impossibility, of wringing any farther plunder from the church. But although it is clear that mercenary motives either made or confirmed religious reformers in many instances, it is obviously untrue that any other than theological causes began the secession from Rome. Nor is this secession liable to any solid objection from the selfish conduct of many who promoted it. If it were, parity of reasoning would cast suspicion very widely upon social improvements. Perhaps the bulk of these has come from men whose power of effecting them, though often sought under colour of desiring nothing but public good, has been unsparingly used, when gained, for selfish ends. To judge fairly, or safely, therefore, of the Reformation, its own intrinsic merits

⁴ Among the immense mass of published documents relating to the council of Trent, there are but few that came directly from the Roman see. Such papers have rarely emerged from the concealment of the Vatican. One, however, was discovered in MS. in the royal library of Naples, in the spring of 1820, by a protestant divine, who obtained permission to copy it. He subsequently published it with this title: *Bulla Reformationis Pauli Pape Tertii: ad His-*

toriam Concilii Tridentini pertinens: concepta non vulgata. Ex Codice MSOR. Neapolitano descriptam, nunc primum editam annotationibusque illustravit D. H. N. Clausen, Theol. in Univ. Haun. P. P. O. Hauniae, 1830. For the use of this document, which is of great rarity in England, the editor has to thank the Rev. T. H. Horne. The object of it was to transfer the delicate business of reforming abuses from the council to the pope.

must be weighed. But it need not shrink, even when fairly tested by the characters of individuals. Its real authors were ecclesiastics, and not statesmen, princes, or minions of the great. The clerical reformers, however, were chiefly unexceptionable, and often high, both in morals and attainments. This is not only capable of proof from documentary evidence, but is also evident from the ridiculous tales which Romish opponents have produced to blacken their memories. If more solid allegations could have been made, posterity would not have been mocked by the absurdities recorded about Luther and Cranmer. Besides, if personal motives are to receive so much weight in an estimate of the reformers, they must apply with equal force to the other party. It is obvious that many men sought professional advancement as Romish polemics, and that multitudes more were very deeply interested in the protection of existing establishments. Among these individuals, too, no small proportion were open to serious imputations upon moral character, and such have been freely cast upon them by their opponents. A church, indeed, so wealthy as that established in western Europe, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and seemingly then so secure of permanence, could not fail of sheltering a great mass of clerical irregularity, or even delinquency; especially as the times were gross, extensive notoriety was to be feared by none but the very highest, and public opinion was only in its infancy. It is, accordingly, equally well known and undeniable, that moral stains attached to the characters of many leading ecclesiastics, from the popes downwards, at the period when Luther arose, and for a long series of years afterwards. Thus, if personalities are to bear considerably upon the Reformation, its friends may easily make more effective use of them than the adverse party can. A reason, however, may still be asked for the stationary position to which protestantism was reduced when church-plunder became impracticable, or nearly so. The answer to such a question requires no long search. The Romish religion embodied all the prejudices that men inherited from Christianity, and the least offensive of those

which they inherited from Paganism. After the council of Trent had sitten, and numerous divines, competent for the task, had applied themselves to it, the doctrinal system of Rome was formally authenticated, and strongly protected by scholarly appliances. Governments and political parties identified themselves with one or the other of the adverse creeds. Exertions to retain and recover ground were made by the Romanists, which protestants had not at command. They were too much divided, and too much impoverished by the cupidity of leading laymen who had reared fortunes as the price of affording them protection, when it was most needful. They wanted, besides, those organized combinations which Rome has in the monastic orders, especially in the Jesuits, who started into life as opponents of the Reformation, and who are admirably fitted for undermining it. Romanism, besides, though hastily dismissed as priestcraft and mummery by those who really know nothing about it, has an immense fund of popular attractions. It has historical, antiquarian, and polemic strength; has made a fascinating alliance with architecture, painting, statuary, and music; uses a theatrical worship, and ritual consolations; consecrates pretty toys, and prescribes gaudy dresses; offers facilities for the indulgence of a gloomy fanaticism, and yet for a very loose profession; has an important advantage in numbers, and one equally great in unity. When such a system once recovered from the first shock of the Reformation, its permanence was palpably traceable to many causes more solid than failure of means for securing a further supply of mercenary adversaries.

A remarkable feature in *modern* ecclesiastical history is the democratic spirit that has appeared in certain sections of the Christian world. The circumstances under which their convictions took a new direction, rendered some of the reformed churches unable to command episcopal government, when first they separated from Rome. From this inability, rather than from any deliberate wish to violate the established order, arose ecclesiastical bodies without the usual accompaniments of epis-

copal heads. But such communities having been formed, ingenious men were not slow in arguing that any other system of church discipline was irreconcilable with the earliest years of primitive antiquity, and injurious to the best interests of religion. These positions, however, are so much at variance with an immense preponderance of ecclesiastical authorities, that advocacy of them demands a most resolute reliance upon private opinion. Upon this necessity have been founded assertions of an illimitable right to the exercise of individual judgment. Claims of this kind are popularly described as resting upon the Reformation, and intended by its authors for the cherished inheritance of future ages. Yet it is observable that whenever new churches gained a secure footing, provision was made for staying a licentious pruriency of theological speculation, by promulgating confessions of faith. But this policy, and the inferences naturally flowing from it, are generally overlooked: the only fact bearing upon the question brought forward being the appeal originally made to public opinion upon the propriety or necessity of seceding from Rome. Those who thus appealed are thereby often represented as authorities for a boundless liberty of conscience. A habit of claiming this indulgence in religion has extended to politics; and the low-church party, as it is called, has been conspicuous for democratic opinions, almost ever since the Reformation. It has not, indeed, appeared, that such opinions are incompatible with partiality for the ancient system of ecclesiastical polity. Romanists have latterly made no difficulty in contracting a strict alliance with men who act under republican impulses, and episcopalian protestants form attached citizens in democratic America. But it is worthy of remark, that republican opinions did not originate among protestant bodies, adhering to the ancient system of ecclesiastical discipline. They arose among such as took divinity from the Calvinistic school, and they are, in truth, closely connected with some of the theological principles on which that school is founded.

From *modern ecclesiastical history* may be learnt also the

value of liturgies and other well-guarded formularies. At the outset of the Reformation, Romanists were often embarrassed by seeing protestants retain the three creeds, and in reality profess a belief in all such religious principles contained in the ancient service-books, as did not rather wear the appearance of interpolations, and often might be convicted of this character by sufficient evidence. To repel unfavourable inferences from these facts, it was usual to treat all this orthodoxy as a mere artifice, or, at best, an evanescent homage to truth which would soon leave not a single trace under an unrestrained access to error. Events unhappily have given something of a prophetic appearance to the latter of these imputations. The Calvinistic school of theology, although unquestionably sound on its original formation, and long afterwards, has degenerated rather widely, though far from universally, into opinions of a Socinian or sceptical character. But although Romish anticipations have thus been partially realised, in well-guarded sections of the reformed body they have wholly failed. The church of England in particular, which is the best organized of all the religious bodies that have separated from Rome, retains a strict conformity to those great principles of theology which were defined in the earliest general councils, and embodied in the established creeds. Yet among those who live within her community, and even among those who eat her bread, individuals have always existed inclinable to theology of a Socinian cast. Their efforts, however, have proved powerless to produce any extensive or permanent effect. The discipline and formularies of the church quickly reduce such innovators to insignificance. Their places are soon supplied by others attentive only to the established landmarks of belief, and their eagerness to break out upon a wider field of speculation lives only in the brief recollection of a confined neighbourhood, or among the half-forgotten volumes of a library. A due regard for antiquity, therefore, and religious formularies which regularly enter into public worship, have been found by experience effective safeguards of soundness and steadiness in doctrine. On the contrary, a neglect of these pro-

tections has afforded an opening to some of the evils which Romanists rashly declared inseparable from abandonment of their communion.

As an introduction to the knowledge of all these interesting and important subjects, no work, probably, can be named, of greater impartiality, research, and general utility, than Mosheim's *Institutes*. Readers, however, who are only entering upon the study of ecclesiastical history, should beware of supposing that any compilation of such limited extent will put them sufficiently in possession either of all the facts detailed, or of any one section among them. Those who would accurately estimate *primitive* church history must still go to the fountain-heads of such knowledge, Eusebius and the other ancient Greek ecclesiastical writers, together with the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses*, *Baronius*, and the larger compilers of a still more modern date. For this purpose, too, may be advantageously used Mosheim *De Rebus Christianis ante Constantinum Magnum*, together with his *Dissertations relating to Ecclesiastical History*⁵. For all but the later portions of *medieval* church history the Centuriators and Baronius must again be consulted, together with some of the original writers and compilers more or less modern, who have illustrated the great compilations of those admirable scholars, and continued them downwards. For

⁵ *Dissertationum ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentium Volumen*. Alton. 1733. In this volume are to be found, *De Aetate Apologetici Tertulliani, et Initio Persecutionis sub Setero*; *De turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesiam*; *De Causis suppositorum Librorum inter Christianos Sæculi primi et secundi*; *De Vera Aetate Apologetici quem Athenagoras pro Christianis scripsit*; *De Studio Ethnicorum Christianos imitandi*; *Demonstratio Sectæ Nicolaitarum*; *Supplementum ad præcedentem de Nicolaitis Dissertationem*; *De Joanne in fereens Oleum conjecto*; *ad vir. max. zen. amplissimumque Chr. Aug. Heumannum Epistola*; *ad vir. celeb. Chr. Aug. Heum. Epistola responsoria*; *Dissertatio qua ostenditur, certo hodie et explorare con-*

silui non posse, utrum Elion quidam novæ Sectæ Auctor extiterit inter Christianos, necne? *De Gallorum Appellationibus ad Concilium Universæ Ecclesiæ, Unitatem Ecclesiæ spectabilem tollentibus.* (occasioned by the contests on the bull *Unigenitus*.) *De Turbis Sacris in Ecclesia Gostariensi a tempore Reformationis.* (This is not Mosheim's, but by his friend Trumphius, and admitted among his own dissertations, as likely to be found useful.) *Michaelis Geddesii Martyrologium eorum qui in Hispania ob professionem Religionis Protestantium supremo supplicio affecti sunt, ex Anglico Latine versum*; *Laudatio Funebris Joh. Andr. Schmidii.*

the *Reformation*, Sleidan, Seckendorf, and historians of particular countries must be read. *Modern* church history very much loses its hold upon the attention of individuals as a whole, and will seldom be read with any great interest or profit, unless the historians of the reader's own country receive his particular notice. But although it would be delusive to recommend Mosheim's *Institutes*, even with the large additions made to them by others, as a sufficient source of information upon ecclesiastical history, the work may be safely pronounced a most useful guide to farther acquisitions. It will also be found quite adequate to the wants of such as have neither the time, the inclination, nor the need of a critical acquaintance with the whole subject, or with any particular portion of it. Readers of this kind will meet with a considerable mass of information upon every period in the history of the church. They will easily see the importance of such knowledge, not only to fill the mind with that knowledge of events which is necessary to those who occupy a liberal position, but also to correct that aptitude for surprise which is general among people of deficient information. Something or other comes prominently forward, and such people treat it as an important novelty. If they had only possessed a moderate acquaintance with the church's history, they would have easily pointed out its appearance before, either under the same name, or some other, and from its fate then would have predicted its insignificance now.

A knowledge of ecclesiastical history is also necessary to explain and correct civil history. This latter has rarely been written by authors conversant with religious affairs; and not unfrequently have historical compilations been made under a prejudice against the church and its concerns. The consequence has been, that many works, even of high merit, contain incorrect and unfair views of the church and her ministers. Statesmen have often used her for their own purposes, which have involved many times and countries in confusion. A habit of regarding religion merely in connexion with politics, engenders a disposition to treat it as intrinsically a political engine, and that preju-

dice against it which is natural to man, easily awakens a desire to rank it among the most mischievous engines of this kind. Ecclesiastical history, however, has been usually written by clergymen, and its ordinary tenour brings religious questions, and men professedly conversant with them, prominently forward. It is thus seen that princes and statesmen were not the originators of religious movements, though they have made dexterous and unsparing use of them for their own selfish ends, when once set on foot by others. Ecclesiastical writers, too, have a more perfect knowledge of the feelings and position of men in their own order than any layman can possess. Hence they are the fairest and safest guides upon ecclesiastical questions. They have naturally their prejudices and partialities, like other men, and these defects may be advantageously corrected by the views of lay authors; but of the two classes of writers they will generally be found far the more trustworthy, upon questions within their own profession, and upon such subjects lay prejudice will be found far more in want of a corrective than ecclesiastical. Even those, however, who would scruple to admit this view, must, in candour, suspect some degree of prejudice on either side, and must, therefore, allow that no reader of history can have made acquisitions in that branch of knowledge deserving of much confidence, until he has given due attention to the ecclesiastical section of it.

In the American edition of this work, its own Index closes each of the three volumes. But this arrangement is obviously inconvenient. It requires a considerable knowledge of ecclesiastical history, and a pretty complete recollection of its various ingredients, to decide upon the particular portion of it likely to furnish information that might be wanted. Hence it was thought advisable to disregard Dr. Murdock's Index altogether, and to make one entirely new, extending over the whole four volumes. Facility of reference is thus, undoubtedly, improved, and as the work is essentially one of reference, this matter is of considerable importance.

As these volumes, though all passing under the venerated

name of Mosheim, and chiefly filled by his invaluable labours, really contain a great mass of matter from other pens, the reader will necessarily find in them considerable diversities of all kinds. This peculiarity is rendered more conspicuous by the differences of sentiment entertained by the several authors. They have, indeed, little in common beyond a desire to give all the information allowed by their several limits, and a protestant anxiety to speak the truth fully upon questions relating to the church of Rome. Adherents of that church may complain of them all upon that score. But such complaints are of no value unless it can be shown that positive injustice has been done to the Romish party. This, however, it is hoped and believed, cannot be shown. Circumstances, indeed, are freely detailed, and inferences drawn unfavourable to the papal church; but extenuating facts have also their due place and importance. To omit any of the details or views which Romanists may dislike, would have been treachery to the protestant cause: treachery, therefore, it is conceived, to the souls of men. Well-informed holders of reformed opinions consider popery as no other than the modern branch of that grand apostasy which anciently depraved the patriarchal faith, and now the Christian. They consider the Old and New Testaments as both levelled especially against this very corruption of the truth, and it is perfectly undeniable that this view rests upon a deep and scholarly foundation. Any student may, therefore, be at least excusable in taking the protestant side in this momentous controversy: but any one who has taken that side will not be so easy to excuse, if he write ecclesiastical history in such a manner as to withhold any thing of his own convictions in this matter from the minds of his readers. The question between the church of Rome and those who have left her communion, does not involve mere questions of discipline, or ceremonies, or of opinion substantially identical. It embraces points bearing vitally upon religious belief. The necessity, too, for treating such questions fully, though candidly, has

been increased by the progress of events. Romanists have been for several years courting prominence, and the whole controversy between them and their opponents is likely again by their means to be forced upon mankind, however desirous the majority may be to bury it in oblivion. Thus a knowledge of ecclesiastical history is indispensable as a preparation for discussions which no inquirer into religious truth may long be able to decline. Nor need any complaint be made of unfavourable lights thrown upon the Romish controversy, unless they can be convicted of a deficiency in candour and information. Political changes, and the re-action flowing from the irreligious temper of the last generation, have given Romanism opportunities for a favourable appearance, and for a favourable reception too, which have been skilfully improved, and which demand an unshrinking, though temperate and scholarly exposure from the adverse party.

In a work of great length, written by several different individuals, some repetitions are unavoidable. They flow, in fact, from a peculiarity in these volumes, which improves their value for reference, however it may lower it for continuous reading; namely, the diversified authorship that has produced them. This has undoubtedly given to the work something of a miscellaneous character, but it has also very much obviated that suspicion of partiality which would have been likely to be entertained by sections of the protestant body, at variance with his own, if the whole mass of materials had been put together by a single writer. In their actual state, these volumes may confidently ask a favourable consideration from any protestant: every considerable section of the religious community separated from Rome appearing in them at sufficient length, and from a partial pen. The British islands and the church of England thus occupy at length that space among Mosheim's labours to which a country and a church of so much importance are fully entitled, but which has hitherto been denied, from the prejudices and imperfect information of dissenting

editors. This new edition, therefore, of a work which has long been a standard authority in England, may supply, it is hoped, to a considerable degree, the acknowledged want of an ecclesiastical history, sufficiently able and extensive, from a native of the country, and a member of the national church.

CONTENTS

OF

VOL. I.

	PAGE
Translator's Preface—Account of the Author	1
Author's Preface	9
Introduction	15

CENTURY I.

State of the Roman empire	25
Its evils and advantages	26
Other nations	27
Paganism	ib.
Of little moral efficacy	31
The Roman and Grecian religions	33
Religions beyond the Roman empire	ib.
Philosophy deficient in moral efficacy	34
Epicureans and Academics	ib.
Aristotelians	36
Stoics	ib.
Platonics	ib.
Eclectics	37
Herod the Great	39
State of the Jews	40
Corruption of their religion	ib.
Their three principal sects	41
Their traditions	43
Their toleration	44
The Essenes and Therapeutæ	45
Low state of popular religion	46
The <i>Cabbala</i>	47
Pagan adulterations of Judaism	ib.
The Samaritans	48
Jews in foreign countries	49
The life of Jesus Christ	50

	PAGE
The Apostles and the seventy disciples	52
Fame of Christ out of Judæa	53
His death, resurrection, and ascension	54
Inspiration, and first preaching of the Apostles	55
Election of a new apostle	56
Conversion of St. Paul	ib.
The primitive church of Jerusalem	57
Missions of the Apostles	58
Respect for Christ among Pagans	60
Causes of the success of Christianity	61
Fictitious causes	62
Christians persecuted in Palestine	63
Also by Jews in foreign countries	64
Divine judgments on the Jews	65
Ten pagan persecutions	ib.
Roman laws against Christianity	ib.
Causes of hostility to them	66
Slanders against Christians	67
Martyrs and confessors	68
Nero's persecution	69
Domitian's	73
Defective knowledge of Eastern philosophy	75
Its general tenour productive of Gnosticism	77
Jewish philosophy	82
State of learning in various countries	83
Teachers of the church	84
Constitution of the primitive church	86
Episcopacy in the first century	91
Independence of churches	92
Canon of the New Testament	93
Apocryphal writings	94
Clemens Romanus	95
Ignatius of Antioch	98
Polycarp, Barnabas, and Hermas	99
Character of the apostolic fathers	100
Christian faith and morals	101
Mode of teaching Christianity	102
The Apostles' Creed	ib.
Catechumens and the faithful	104
Christian schools and academies	ib.
Secret doctrine	105
Lives and characters of Christians	106
Excommunication	ib.
Controversies among Christians	107
Judaizing Christians	108
Sacraments appointed by Christ	109
Rites of apostolic institution	ib.
Jewish rites retained	110
The Christian Sabbath	ib.
Places of religious meeting	111

	PAGE
Mode of worship	112
The eucharist and <i>agapæ</i>	113
Baptism	ib.
Unction of the Sick	114
Fasts	ib.
Sects in the apostolic age	115
Their gradual increase	116
The Gnostics	117
Dositheus	120
Simon Magus	121
Menander	124
The Nicolaitans	125
Cerinthus and the Cerinthians	126
Nazarenes and Ebionites	128

CENTURY II.

Character of the Roman emperors	131
Propagation of Christianity	133
Scriptural versions	136
<i>Apologies</i> for the Christians	137
Miraculous powers	138
The Thundering Legion	139
Jewish insurrection under Bar-Chochebas	141
Persecution under Trajan	143
Persecution under Adrian	144
Favourable edict of Antoninus Pius	145
Renewed persecution under Antoninus the Philosopher	146
Martyrdoms of Polycarp and Justin	147
Persecutions of Lyons and Vienne	ib.
Persecution under Severus	ib.
Literary attacks upon Christianity	148
The new Platonics	151
The Eclectics	152
Ammonius Saccas	153
His principles injurious to Christianity	157
The episcopal system completely organized	159
Councils brought into use	160
Metropolitans and Patriarchs	161
A Christian Hierarchy formed on the Jewish model	ib.
Ecclesiastical writers	162
Gradual corruption of Christianity	171
Rise of ascetic principles	175
Deception for the sake of religion	178
Increase of ceremonies	180
The Paschal Controversy	184
Administration of the Lord's Supper	186
Administration of Baptism	187

	PAGE
The Nazarenes	189
The Ebionites	190
The Elcesaites	191
Saturninus	192
The Marcionites	193
Bardesanes and Tatian	194
Egyptian Gnostics	196
Basilides	ib.
Carpocrates	198
The Valentinians	199
Minor Gnostic sects	202
The Ophites, or Serpentians	203
The Patripassians	204
The Artemonites	205
Hermogenes	206
The Montanists	207

CENTURY III.

Improved condition of the Christians	211
Labours of Origen	214
Conversion of the Goths	ib.
Establishment of churches in Gaul and Germany	215
Persecution under Maximin	217
Persecution under Decius	ib.
Succeeding persecutions	219
Improved condition of the Christians	220
Platonic tampering with Christianity	ib.
Decay of learning	223
Precedence conceded to the Roman see	226
Minor orders established	228
Prejudices in favour of clerical celibacy	229
Origen	230
Cyprian	237
Less distinguished writers	239
Platonic theology	243
Origin of mysticism	245
Zeal for the diffusion of Scripture	246
Prevailing errors in controversy	251
Expectation of the Millennium	253
The baptism of Heretics	254
Contests respecting Origen	256
Increase of religious ceremonies	257
Baptismal usages	259
Stated Fasts, and times of prayer	260
Manes and the Manichæans	262
The Hieracites	269
Noëtus and the Patripassians	270

	PAGE
Sabellius	271
Beryllus of Bostra	273
Paul of Samosata	ib
The Arabian sect	274
Novatian and Novatus	275

CENTURY IV.

Peaceful state of the church	281
Persecution of Diocletian	283
Conversion of Constantine	288
His vision of the Cross	291
Persecution of Licinius	294
Julian the Apostate	296
Subsequent prosperity of the church	300
Literary attacks upon Christianity	301
Establishment of the Armenian church	304
Conversion of Abyssinia	ib.
Conversion of Georgia	305
Establishment of the Gothic church	ib.
Martin of Tours	306
Persecution of Sapor, king of Persia	307
Increasing literature of the Christians	311
The first council of Nice	312
Augmented power of the bishops	313
Correspondence of the ecclesiastical and civil jurisdictions	314
Pre-eminence of the Roman see	317
A secondary rank given to that of Constantinople	319
Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian	321
Athanasius	322
Basil	323
Chrysostom	325
Lactantius	335
Ambrose	ib
Jerome	ib.
Augustine	338
Rufinus	340
Latin writers of less note	342
Increase of Pagan usages and principles	345
Jerome's version of Scripture	347
Literary defects of the age	352
Rise of Monachism	353
Pious frauds and intolerance	357
The Meletians	358
The Eustathians	360
The Luciferians	361
Aërius	362
Jovinian's opposition to Asceticism	363

	PAGE
Origenism	364
Pagan usages engrafted on Christianity	366
Origin of ecclesiastical patronage	368
Diversities in religious worship	ib.
Observation of Sunday and festivals	369
Fasting	370
Erection of baptisteries	371
Rise of masses for the dead	372
The Donatists	375
The <i>Circumcelliones</i>	377
Rise and progress of Arianism	380
The first council of Nice	385
Athanasius	391
Various fortunes of Arianism	394
Minor Arian sects	397
Apollinaris and the Apollinarians	399
Marcellus	400
Photinus	401
Macedonius	402
The Priscillianists	405
Audeus	407
The Messalians, or Euchites	408
The Antidico-Marianites and Collyridians	410

CENTURY V.

Laws against Paganism	412
Extension of the Oriental church	413
Conversion of German tribes	414
Conversion of the Franks	ib.
Conversion of Ireland	416
Opposition of the Pagans	419
Persian persecution	420
Decline of solid learning	422
Incipient popularity of Aristotle	425
The patriarchal sees	427
Degeneracy of the clergy	431
Increase of monastic importance	433
Ecclesiastical writers	434
Rise of the invocation of saints	450
Rise of a belief in purgatory	451
Progress of Mysticism	456
Pillar-Saints	457
Vigilantius against prevailing corruptions	459
Banishment and death of Chrysostom	460
Institution of the Rogation days	462
Abolition of the <i>Agape</i>	463
Origin of auricular confession	ib.
Persecution of the Donatists	464

	PAGE
Arian persecution of the Catholics	467
Nestorius and the Nestorians	468
The council of Ephesus	472
Barsumas	477
Eutyches	479
The council of Chalcedon	481
Peter the Fuller	483
Zeno's <i>Henoticon</i>	484
Division of the Monophysites	485
Pelagius and Pelagianism	487
Rise of a belief in reprobation	491
Semi-Pelagianism	494
POPES	497
PRINCIPAL COUNCILS	499

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

To supply the more intelligent, and especially the younger clergy with a comprehensive history of the Christian religion and church from the earliest times to the present day,—a history which shall touch all the more important facts, briefly and distinctly, yet candidly, and with constant references to authorities and to sources of additional information, and thus be a complete guide to those who wish to go deeply into this science, and afford of itself a good general knowledge of the whole subject;—such was the design of Dr. *Mosheim* in the following work, and such has been the aim of the present translator.

The great need of such a work at the present day, when every other branch of theology is much cultivated, is so generally felt, that it is unnecessary to say any thing to evince its importance, or to excite an interest on the subject. The only things therefore, which here claim attention, are, the character and history of Dr. *Mosheim* and his work, the reasons for giving it in a new translation, and the additions made to it by way of notes.

John Lawrence von Mosheim was nobly born at Lubeck, October 9, 1694. His education was completed at the university of Keil; where he became professor of philosophy at an early age. In youth he cultivated a taste for poetry; and he actually published criticisms on that subject. But pulpit eloquence, biblical and historical theology, and practical religion, were his favourite pursuits. He published seven volumes of

sermons, and left a valuable treatise on preaching, which was printed after his death. The English and French preachers, particularly Tillotson and Watts, Saurin, Massillon, and Flechier, were his models. The Germans admit that he contributed much to improve the style and manner of preaching in their country. While a professor at Kiel, his reputation rose so high, that the king of Denmark invited him to a professorship at Copenhagen. But the duke of Brunswick soon after, in the year 1725, called him to the divinity chair at Helmstadt; which he filled with great applause for twenty-two years. In 1747, when George II., king of England, the founder of the university of Gottingen, wished to place over it men of the highest rank in the literary world, Dr. *Mosheim* was deemed worthy to be its chancellor, and the head of the department of theology. In this honourable station he remained eight years, or till his death, September 9, 1755. His works were very numerous; consisting of Latin translations and editions of learned works in English, French, Dutch, and Greek, with valuable notes; an immense number of disquisitions relating to historical, dogmatic, and moral subjects; besides orations, sermons, letters, &c. On church history, in which he most distinguished himself, he published two volumes of essays on detached subjects; and among other works, a compendious church history, in two volumes, 12mo; a full church history of the first century, 4to; Commentary on the affairs of Christians, till the times of Constantine, 4to; and he had just published the revision and enlargement of his compendious church history, under the new title of *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, ancient and modern, in one vol. 4to, when he was removed by death, at the age of 61.

The character of Dr. *Mosheim* is thus given, by his disciple and translator, *J. R. Schlegel*. "We may have had, perhaps, biblical interpreters, who, like *Ernesti* and *Michaelis*, expounded the Scriptures with more philosophical and critical learning: perhaps also, theologians and moralists, who have treated dogmatic and practical theology with more metaphysical precision:

—we may likewise have had, and perhaps still have, pulpit orators, who, among the many unsuccessful imitators of Mosheim's method, have even rivalled him, and come near to that ideal perfection which he wished to see realized. But in ecclesiastical history, the merits of Mosheim are so decisive and peculiar, that I will not venture to compare him with any of his predecessors, or his successors, in this department of learning. He is, as Schroeckh says, our first *real historian* in church history'.¹ Dr. Maclaine informs us, that after he had commenced his translation, he received a letter from bishop Warburton, saying: "*Mosheim's compendium is excellent, the method admirable: in short, the only one deserving the name of an ecclesiastical history. It deserves and needs, frequent notes.*"

Mosheim's Institutes, as well as most of his other historical works, being written in Latin, were accessible to learned foreigners. And Dr. Archibald Maclaine, the son of a dissenting minister in the north of Ireland, and himself an assistant minister to an English congregation at the Hague, published an English translation of these Institutes, so early as the year 1764, only nine years after the appearance of the original. Dutch and French translations were also made; but I know not by whom, or at what time. In 1769, J. A. C. von Einem, a pious but not profound German minister, commenced his German translation of the Institutes. His design was, to bring down the work to the capacities of the unlearned, and to render it an edifying book for common Christians. Accordingly, he omitted nearly all the marginal references and discussions, and introduced much religious biography and historical detail. His translation fills six vols. 8vo, and the continuation of the history three additional volumes. In the year 1770, John R. Schlegel, rector of the gymnasium of Heilbrunn, a learned and judicious man, commenced another German translation, which is very literal and close, and free from all interpolations, but accompanied with learned notes. This translation, in four

¹ Schlegel's *Mosheim*, vol. i. Preface.

large volumes, 8vo, was completed in 1780; and a continuation of the history in two volumes appeared in 1784, and 1788.

The lectures and the printed works of Mosheim on ecclesiastical history, kindled up such ardour for this science in Germany, that in the course of fifty years, *Baumgarten*, *Semler*, *Schroeckh*, *Henke*, and *Schmidt*, severally produced large and valuable church histories. Of these, the most full and complete is that of *Schroeckh*, a pupil of Mosheim, continued by *Tzschirner*, in forty-five vols. 8vo; and next, that of *Henke*, continued by *Vater*, in nine vols. 8vo. Nor has the ardour for this branch of theology yet subsided in Germany: for professor *Neander*, of Berlin, is now publishing a profound and philosophical church history, which, if completed on the plan commenced, will probably fill twenty-five or thirty volumes 8vo. The limits assigned to this preface will not allow a discussion of the merits of these several successors of Mosheim. Suffice it to say, that a careful examination of them all, has resulted in the decided conviction, that Mosheim's history, in a form similar to that given to it by *Schlegel*, is the best adapted to the wants of this country, and the most likely to meet general approbation among the American clergy.

The necessity for a new English version of the Institutes arises principally from the unauthorised liberties taken by the former translator, under the mistaken idea of improving the work, and rendering it more acceptable to the public. He says in his preface: "*The style of the original is by no means a model to imitate, in a work designed for general use. Dr. Mosheim affected brevity, and laboured to crowd many things into few words: thus his diction, though pure and correct, became sententious and harsh, without that harmony which pleases the ear, and those transitions which make a narration flow with ease. This being the case, I have sometimes taken considerable liberties with my author, and followed the spirit of his narrative without adhering strictly to the letter.—and have often added a few sentences, to render an observation more striking, a fact more clear,*

a portrait more finished." Thus Dr. Maclaine frankly owns, that he designed to render the work interesting to those superficial readers, who delight in that harmony which pleases the ear, and in those transitions which make a narration flow with ease; and that he *often* added a few sentences of his own, to give more vivacity and point to the sentiments of his author, or more splendour to their dress. And whoever will be at the pains of comparing his translation with the original, may see that he has essentially changed the *style*, and greatly coloured and altered in many places the *sentiments* of his author; in short, that he has *paraphrased*, rather than *translated*, a large part of the work. The book is thus rendered heavy and tedious to the reader, by its superfluity of words; and likewise obscure and indefinite, and sometimes self-contradictory, by the looseness of its unguarded statements. Its credibility also as a history of facts is impaired, and it fails of carrying full conviction to the mind, because it is stripped of its native simplicity, precision, and candour. For no wise man will confide in a writer, who appears intent on fabricating sonorous and flowing periods, who multiplies splendid epithets, and habitually deals in loose and unqualified assertions. Nor is this all, for the old translation has actually exposed Dr. Mosheim to severe and unmerited censure, from different quarters: and Dr. *Maclaine* has long stood accused before the public, as a translator, "who has interwoven his own sentiments in such a manner with those of the original author, both in the notes and in the text, that it is impossible for a mere English reader to distinguish them; and in divers instances, he has entirely contradicted him. This (add the accusers) will be evident to all, if a literal translation of Mosheim shall ever be published²." It is not strange therefore, that so large a portion of the community have been dissatisfied with Dr. Maclaine's Mosheim, and have desired a more faithful and literal version of this valuable author.

² See the New York edition of Maclaine's *Mosheim*, in 1824, vol. iv. p. 284.

If the translation here offered to the public is what it was intended to be, it is a close, literal version, containing neither more nor less than the original, and presenting the exact thoughts of the author in the same direct, artless, and lucid manner, with as much similarity in the phraseology and modes of expression as the idioms of the two languages would admit. That all the elegancies of the Latin style and diction of the author have been retained, is not pretended. The translator can only say, he has aimed to give Mosheim, as far as he was able, the same port and mien in English that he has in Latin.

But writing out an entirely new and independent translation of the Institutes, has not been half the labour bestowed on the work. Every where the statements of Mosheim have been compared with the sources from which they were drawn, and with the representations of other standard writers of different communities, so far as the means of doing this were at hand. The reasonings also of Mosheim have been weighed with care. And nothing has been suffered to go before the public without first passing an examination by the best criteria within the reach of the translator. Often days and weeks have been consumed in such examinations, when the results were, that Mosheim's statements needed no correction, or at least that no palpable errors were discovered in them; and it was therefore deemed advisable to allow him to express his own views without note or comment. But in many instances the translator supposed that he discovered mistakes or defects in his author which called for animadversion. In these cases he has given in the form of notes such statements and criticisms as he deemed necessary. Numerous other instances occurred in which Mosheim was found to differ from other standard writers, or to have simply omitted what the translator or others deemed worth inserting; and in such cases the opinions or statements of other writers have been given, that the reader might be able to compare them, and the omitted matter has been supplied. In the history of the *primitive church*, for two or three centuries, the translator deemed almost every thing interesting which can be learned with any

degree of certainty. Accordingly, his notes and animadversions here are more frequent and minute than in the subsequent parts of the work.—In regard to what are called the *fathers*, especially those of the four first centuries, and likewise the *leading men* in the church in all ages, he has deemed it proper greatly to enlarge the account given by Mosheim; not so much by minutely tracing the history of their private lives, as by more fully stating their *public* characters and acts, and mentioning such of their works as have come down to us. In no one respect has the history been more enlarged than in this. Through all the ages down to the Reformation, the eminent men, whom Mosheim thought proper to name particularly, have each a distinct note assigned them, containing all of much importance which can be said of them: and in each century, at the close of Mosheim's list of eminent men, nearly a complete catalogue of all those omitted by him is subjoined, with brief notices of the most material things known concerning them.—On the controversies and disputes among Christians, especially such as related to religious *doctrines*, much and critical attention has been bestowed. So also the reputed *heresies*, and the different *sects* of professed Christians, which Mosheim had treated with great fulness and ability, have been carefully re-examined, and subjected to critical remarks. Here great use has been made of the writers who succeeded Mosheim; and particularly the younger *Walch*.—The propagation of Christianity, especially among the nations of Europe in the middle ages, and among the Asiatics by the Nestorians, has been the subject of frequent and sometimes long notes.—The origin and history of the *Reformation*, particularly in countries not of the Augsburg confession; also the contests between the Lutherans and the Reformed, and the history of the English and Scotch churches, and of the English dissenters; have received particular attention: and the occasional mistakes of Mosheim have been carefully pointed out. Yet the enlargements of the history since the times of Luther, and particularly during the seventeenth century, have been the less considerable, because there was danger of swelling the third volume to a dis-

proportionate size, and because another opportunity is anticipated for supplying these omissions.

These remarks may give some idea of the extensive additions to the original by way of notes. All additions to the work are carefully distinguished from the original, by being inclosed in brackets. They are also accompanied with a notice of the persons responsible for their truth and correctness. What the translator gives as his own, he subscribes with a *Tr.* When he borrows from others, which he has done very largely, he either explicitly states what is borrowed, and from whom, or subjoins the name of the author. Thus several notes are borrowed directly from *Maclaine*: and these are not only marked as quotations, but they have the signature *Macl.* annexed. A few others are translated from *von Einem's* Mosheim; and these have the signature *von Ein.* affixed. But the learned and judicious *Schlegel* has been taxed for the greatest amount of contributions. Throughout the work his notes occur, translated from the German, and with the signature *Schl.* annexed.

The work is now divided—perhaps for the first time—into *three* volumes, of nearly equal size, each embracing a grand and distinct period of church history, strongly marked with its own peculiar characteristics; and being furnished with a separate Index, each volume is a complete and independent work of itself¹.

A continuation of the history to the present time is deemed so important, that the translator intends, if his life and health are spared, to attempt a compilation of this sort as soon as the printing of these volumes shall be completed.

New Haven,
February 22, 1832.

¹ The work was so published in America, but the additions made to it are so considerable, that they suggested

a division into four volumes instead of three. The convenience of a single Index is obvious.—*Ed.*

THE
AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

My *Institutes of Christian History*¹ having been long out of print, the worthy person at whose expense they were published, has often requested me to give a new edition of them, somewhat improved and enlarged. This request, I for many years resisted; for I was reluctant to suspend other works, then on my hands, which I deemed more important; besides, I must acknowledge that I shrank from the task of supplying corrections and needful additions to a book, in which I myself saw numerous deficiencies. But importunities, from the publisher, and from some learned men who joined with him, at length overcame my tardiness: and now after the leisure hours of two years have been spent on the work, it is brought to a close. My *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History* make, however, their appearance, not only in a new form and dress, but so materially changed, as to be almost entirely a new work.

The distribution of materials into certain classes, which I deemed before most convenient for learners, I could not make up my mind to remove; although reasons have occurred to me for preferring a continuous and unbroken narrative. But some excellent men have communicated to me the results of their experience as to the utility of the former method, and this has made me determine upon retaining it. A little reflection will,

¹ [A work in 2 vols. 12mo, first published in 1737-41; and afterwards abridged by J. P. Miller, in 1 vol. 12mo, Hamb. 1752. *Tr.*]

indeed, convince us, that whoever would embrace in a single book all things needful for knowing the state of Christianity in every age, must adopt a certain principle of classification and distribution. I have, accordingly, left the form of my work unchanged, and have thought only of its correction, improvement, and enlargement, so as to render it more fit for use.

My principal care has been, to impart fidelity and authority to the narration. For this purpose, I have gone to the primary sources of information, such as the best writers of all ages, who lived in or near the times they describe; and have consulted them with attention; transcribing them when brief, clear, and nervous. Those who write summaries of history, commonly do no more than abridge the more voluminous historians: and this method I myself before pursued to a considerable degree. But such a procedure, though sometimes justifiable, and not to be wholly condemned, is attended with this evil, that it perpetuates the mistakes, which are apt to abound in very large and voluminous works; by causing them to pass from a single book into numerous others. I had long known this from numberless instances, but I felt it again with considerable mortification when I brought the light of testimony from the best authorities, to shine on the pages of my own work. I now perceived that writers pre-eminent for their diligence and fidelity, are not always to be trusted; and found that I had abundant occasion for adding, expunging, changing, and correcting in every part of my book. In performing this task, I know that I have not been wanting in patience and industry, or in watchfulness and care; but whether these have secured me against all mistakes, which is confessedly of no easy accomplishment, I leave *them* to judge who are best informed in ecclesiastical affairs. To aid persons disposed to institute such inquiries, I have, in general, made distinct reference to my authorities; and if I have perverted their testimony, either by misstatement or misapplication, I confess myself to be less excusable than other transgressors in this way, because I had before me all the authors whom I quote, and I turned

them over, and read and compared them with each other, being resolved to follow solely their guidance.

This desire, to render my history as authentic and correct as the best authorities would permit and require, has caused many and various changes and additions, throughout the work: but in no part of it are the alterations greater, or more noticeable, than in the *Third Book*, which contains the history of the church, and especially the Latin or western church, from the time of Charlemagne to the reformation by Luther. This period of ecclesiastical history, though it embraces great events, and is very important on account of the light it casts on the origin and causes of the present civil and religious state of Europe, thereby enabling us correctly to estimate and judge of many things that occur in our own times, has not hitherto been treated with the same neatness, perspicuity, and solidity as the other parts of church history. Here the number of original writers is great: yet few of them are in common use, or are of easy acquisition: they all frighten us, either with their bulk, the barbarity of their style, or their excessive price: not a few of them, either knowingly, or ignorantly, corrupt the truth; or at least, obscure it by their ignorance and unskillfulness: and some of them have not yet been published. It is not strange, therefore, that many things in this part of ecclesiastical history should be either passed over in silence, or be less happily stated and explained, even by the most laborious and learned authors. Among these, the ecclesiastical annalists, and the historians of the monastic sects, so famous in the Roman church, as *Baronius Raynald*, *Bzovius*, *Munriquez*, *Wadding*, and others, though richly supplied with ancient manuscripts and records, have often committed more faults, and fallen into greater mistakes, than writers far inferior to them in learning, reputation, and means of information. Having, therefore, bestowed much attention, during many years, on the history of the church from the eighth century onwards, and believing that I had obtained, from works published or still in manuscript, a better and more correct knowledge of many

events, than is given in the common accounts of those times ; I conceived that I might do service to the cause of ecclesiastical history, by exhibiting to the world some of the results of my investigations ; and that, by throwing some light on the obscure period of the middle ages, I might excite men of talents and industry to pursue the same object, and thus to perfect the history of the Latin church. I persuade myself, that I have brought forward some things which are new, or before little known ; that other things, which had been stated incorrectly or obscurely, I have here exhibited with clearness, and traced back to the proper authorities ; and—claiming the indulgence allowed an old man, to boast a little—that some things, which were accredited fables, I have now exploded. Whether I deceive myself in all this, or not, the discerning reader may ascertain, by examining, and comparing with the common accounts, what I have said respecting Constantine's donation, the *Cathari* and Albigenses, the Beghards and Beguines, the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit, (that pest to many parts of Europe during four centuries,) and of the *Fratricelli* [or Little Brethren], the controversies of the Franciscan order with the Roman pontiffs, Berengarius's case, the Lollards, and several other subjects.

If, in these enlargements of ecclesiastical history, and while giving views either partially or wholly new, I had used the same brevity as on the subjects well stated and explained by many before me, I should neither have satisfied the inquisitive reader, nor have done justice to myself. For many would have regarded *me* as a writer of fables ; and *their* conceptions on these subjects would have been indistinct, useless, and fallacious. Therefore, when I have departed widely from the common statements, or advanced apparent novelties, I have not only aimed to be very explicit, but, in order to give credibility to my narration, have gone into more ample disquisitions and citations of authorities ; because full statements and demonstrations, though out of place in an *epitome* of history, were here indispensable.

In addition to these causes for changing materially the character and swelling the size of my book, another occurred soon after I commenced its revision. I had before designed my work, especially, for *lecturers* on church history, who need a compendious text for the basis of their instructions; and had, therefore, only touched upon many things as openings for enlargement and explanation in the course of tuition. But when I began to recast, revise, and correct the work, I thought it likely to be better received in many quarters, and to be of more use in the learned world, if it were adapted not merely for teachers, but also for those, who, without a teacher, wish to gain a general knowledge of Christian affairs. This opinion had no sooner been formed, than it set me upon supplying omissions, explaining more at large what had been rather obscure, and re-arranging many things so as to place them in a clearer light. Hence it is, that in describing the calamities undergone by the Christians of the first ages, more pains than usual are taken to state precisely the truth; and in tracing the origin and progress of the sects which disturbed the church, great accuracy is attempted; so, likewise, the innovations in religion, devised by those who love new things, are calmly and candidly described with all possible fidelity; and religious contests and disputes are more clearly stated, and the arguments more carefully weighed, than before; and the history of the Roman pontiffs, after the times of Charlemagne, their wars, and their various enterprises, have received more careful attention. I mention these only as specimens of what has been attempted for the advantage of those who cannot pursue a regular course of church history, from their want of books or leisure, and yet wish to obtain clear and correct views of the principal facts and transactions. The book may be safely trusted, for the most part, by such readers: and it will afford them as much knowledge as will satisfy one that reads only for practical purposes; and, besides, will direct to the authors from whom more full information may be obtained.

It would be folly, and betray ignorance of human imperfec-

tion, if I should suppose that no errors *could* be detected ; and that nothing needed correction in all the details of so large a history ; yet, conscious of my own integrity and good faith, and of the pains I have taken to avoid mistakes, I cannot but hope that I have rarely so failed, that serious evils will result from my errors.

I could add some other prefatory remarks, which would, perhaps, not be useless ; but nothing more need be added to enable those to judge correctly of the present work who will be candid and ingenuous, and who are competent judges in such matters. I therefore conclude by offering the just tribute of my gratitude to Almighty God, who has given me strength, amidst the infirmities of age, and the pressure of other labours and cares, to surmount the difficulties, and bear the fatigue, of completing the work now given to the public.

*Göttingen,
March 23, 1755.*

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Ecclesiastical History defined.—§ 2. Its divisions.—§ 3. The external history of the Church.—§ 4. Which treats of the prosperous.—§ 5. and the adverse events.—§ 6. The internal history.—§ 7. Which treats of (1) Ministers.—§ 8, 9. (II) Doctrines.—§ 10. (III) Worship.—§ 11. (IV) Heresies.—§ 12. Events must be traced to their causes.—§ 13. Means of discovering these causes, general.—§ 14. and particular; in the external.—§ 15. and internal history.—§ 16. The sources of ecclesiastical history.—§ 17. Qualities of the historian.—§ 18. He must be free from all prejudices.—§ 19. Faults of historians.—§ 20. Uses of ecclesiastical history, general.—§ 21. and special.—§ 22, 23. Method in ecclesiastical history ; division into periods.—§ 24. Distribution under heads.

§ 1. THE *Ecclesiastical History of the New Dispensation* is a clear and faithful narrative of those affairs, which have either happened from without, to that society of men which takes its name from Christ, or have been transacted within its own body. In this, events are so connected with their causes, that men may both see God's providence, in establishing and preserving it, and grow not less in piety, than in wisdom.

§ 2. It can scarcely be better and more perfectly placed under view, than by considering the company of men which we mentioned, as a state ruled by certain laws and institutions, under a regular government. To such a state, many things must happen from without, which either make for its interest, or are against it; and since nothing human is stable, many things must occur in its own bosom which change its character. Hence its history is most conveniently distributed into the *external* and the *internal*. In the same way should the history of the Christian state be divided: but nothing must be omitted which gives a hope of profit.

§ 3. The branch called *external*, is properly the history of the Christian people, that is, of those who make up Christ's body politic: since it embraces all the changes and vicissitudes of

that holier among commonwealths, which fall under observation. All bodies of people, however, now meet with prosperous fates, now in turn, with adverse: nor have Christians had a different fortune. Hence, this part of ecclesiastical history is fitly divided into an account of the *prosperous*, and of the *calamitous*, events which Christians have experienced.

§ 4. The *prosperous* and *favourable* fates by which the Christian commonwealth has gained importance and extent, have come either from its heads and officers, or from the general body of its members. Heads of the Christian people may be parted into *public* and *private*. The former are kings, magistrates, pontiffs: the latter, teachers, men of learning, weight, and influence. Both have contributed much, at every time, to the body's increase. Great men, by their authority, laws, benefits, nay more, by arms, have both strengthened and enlarged the commonwealth. Teachers, and men renowned for learning, genius, holiness, and virtue, by fearless and famous deeds, by their travels, books, and influence, have recommended with wonderful success the religion that came from Christ, to those who knew it not. Even the Christian populace, by faith, constancy, piety, and love towards God and men, has brought many to subject themselves to Christ.

§ 5. In like manner, the *adverse* fates, on which Christians have fallen, have happened either from the fault of individuals among themselves, or from the hatred and insidious acts of enemies to their religion. That Christians themselves, especially governors of the flock, by negligence, ill-directed exertions, quarrels, and contentions, have stirred up many evils to the people, is testified most abundantly. Enemies of Christ's kingdom, again, are either *public*, or *private*. The *public*, that is, kings and magistrates, by laws and penalties, have obstructed the progress of Christianity. The *private*, I mean philosophers, people infected with superstitions, and contemnners of all religion, have assailed it with criminations, artifices, and books.

§ 6. The *internal history* of the Christian state treats of the changes, to which the church in every age has been exposed, in regard to its distinguishing characteristics, as a religious society. It may, not unsuitably, be called the *history of the Christian religion*. The causes of these internal changes are found, for the most part, in those who have exercised authority over the society. These often so interpret the laws of faith and practice, as either

fancy bids, or interest requires. Should the bulk of their people prove acquiescent and obedient, yet some will occasionally resist, and give birth to seditions and civil wars. To all these subjects the intelligent ecclesiastical historian must direct his attention.

§ 7. The first subject, in the internal history of the church, is the *history of its rulers*, and of its government. Originally the teachers and the people conjointly ruled the Christian commonwealth. But these teachers, in process of time, assumed a loftier spirit, and trampling on the rights of the people, claimed sovereign power, both in sacred and secular affairs. At last, things gradually came to this, that one person held supreme power over the whole church; or, at least, affected to hold it.—Among these governors and guides of the church, some obtained by their writings pre-eminent fame and influence; and as these were by after-ages regarded as oracles and masters, they deserve especial mention among directors of Christian affairs, although sometimes they were not entrusted with any share in the administration of them.

§ 8. The *history of the laws* by which the sacred commonwealth is governed, necessarily follows that of its teachers. The laws peculiar to the Christian community, are of two kinds. Some are *divine*, proceeding from God himself: these are written in those books which Christians very properly believe to be divinely inspired. Others are *human*, and came from governors of the community. The former are usually called *doctrines*: and are divided into two classes, namely, *doctrines of faith*, which govern the understanding, and *moral doctrines*, which control the will.

§ 9. In the history of these laws or *doctrines*, the first thing for observation is, how the book itself of heavenly jurisprudence has been regarded and expounded among Christians, from age to age. For in every period, the state of religion itself has depended on the divine book's authority, or the fashion of interpreting it. Then we have to show what happened to God's ordinances and laws, how they were handled and explained, defended against enemies, at length vitiated and corrupted. Our last matter for consideration is how far Christians obeyed the divine injunctions, or how they lived; nor should we overlook the laws by which rulers sought to restrain the petulance and vices of their people.

§ 10. The *human laws* of which we speak, are prescriptions relating to the external worship of God, or religious rites, whether derived from custom, or from positive enactment. Rites either *directly* appertain to religion, or *indirectly* refer to it. The former embrace the whole exterior of religious *worship*, both public and private. The latter include every thing, except direct worship, that is accounted religious and proper. This part of religious history is very extensive; partly from the variety, and partly from the frequent changes, in ceremonies. A concise history can, therefore, but briefly touch upon it, not accurately treat it.

§ 11. As in civil commonwealths, wars and seditions sometimes break out, so in the Christian state no light stirs have been often made, both on account of doctrines, and of rites. The leaders and authors of these seditions, are called *heretics*; and the opinions for which they separated from other Christians, are called *heresies*. The history of these commotions or heresies, should be full and precise. This labour, if wisely expended, and with impartiality, will well repay the toil: but it is arduous and difficult. For the leaders of these parties have been treated with much injustice; and their doctrines are misrepresented: nor is it easy to come at the truth, in the midst of so much darkness; since most of the writings of those called *heretics* are now lost. Those, therefore, who approach this part of church history, should exclude every thing invidious from the name, *heretic*: and consider it as used only in a more general sense for a man, who, by his own, or by another's fault, has given occasion for wars and disagreements among Christians.

§ 12. He who would handle this history, both externally and internally, so as to be useful, must not only tell *what was done*, but also *why this or that thing happened*, that is, *events* are to be joined with their *causes*. He who narrates naked facts, only furnishes the memory and amuses readers; but he who adds reasons to the deeds, profits them besides, both sharpening their discriminating powers, and rendering them wise. Yet it must be confessed, that caution is here necessary, lest we fabricate causes, and palm our own waking dreams upon men long since dead.

§ 13. In exploring the causes of events, besides *testimonies* themselves, of those engaged in them, and the *history of the times*, a knowledge of *human nature* will be very serviceable. For he

who understands the human character, the propensities and powers, the passions and weaknesses of man, will readily discover the causes of many things attempted or done in former times. Nor will it serve his purpose less to know the *manners and opinions* in which the objects of his attention were brought up. For that is generally esteemed glorious and good which accords with views and habits derived from a former generation.

§ 14. In the history, which we called *external*, we must consider the *civil condition of those states*, in which the Christian religion was either approved, or the reverse: as also their *religious condition*, that is, the opinions of the people concerning the Deity and divine worship. For it will not be difficult to determine, why the church was now prosperous, and now in trouble, if we know what was the form of government, what the character of the rulers, and what the prevailing religion at the time.

§ 15. To dispel obscurities in the *internal* history, nothing is more conducive than a knowledge of the *history of learning*, and especially of *philosophy*. For, most unfortunately, human learning, or philosophy, has, in every age, been allowed more influence, in regard to revealed religion, than was proper, considering the natures of the two things. This end will also be materially served by an accurate inspection of political circumstances and ancient superstition. For the prudence (or shall I call it imprudence?) of prelates, shaped many parts both of Christian discipline and worship after the pattern of the old religions; and no little deference has been paid to the pleasure of sovereigns, and to human laws, in regulating the church of God¹.

§ 16. Whence all this knowledge must be drawn is obvious of itself. The writers, clearly, of every age, who mention Christian affairs, especially those who were contemporary with

¹ [Several of the externals in Romish worship have, undoubtedly, been borrowed from Paganism; most probably, with a view to conciliate prejudice. All Protestants consider this compromise a gross and culpable indiscretion. But they are not equally agreed as to certain questions of discipline, which Dr. Mosheim seems to have considered as also indiscreetly borrowed from ancient

religions. Many of them join the Latin and Oriental churches in denying any such origin to their discipline (except in as far as it may be connected with the divinely-constituted church of ancient Israel), and in considering their adoption of it a sacred duty forced upon them by the whole stream of ecclesiastical tradition, backed by no obscure confirmation from Scripture itself. *Ed.]*

the facts, are to be consulted; since all history depends on testimonies and authorities. Nor are those, however, to be neglected, who, from these, have composed histories and annals. For unwillingness to use another's help, when close at hand, and contempt of their labours, who before us have striven to shed light on things obscure, is near akin to folly².

§ 17. From all this, it will be easy to determine the essential qualifications of a good ecclesiastical historian. He must have no moderate acquaintance with human affairs, various learning, a mind sagacious and practised in ratiocinations, a faithful memory, a judgment strengthened by use and exercise. In his will, there must be patience of labour and industry, a constant endeavour after truth and rectitude, freedom, in fine, from servitude of every kind.

§ 18. Now those who handle this branch of learning are very liable to servitude from three sources, namely, *times*, *persons*, and *opinions*. First, the *times* in which we live often have such ascendancy over us, that we measure past ages by them, thinking that formerly either to have been done, or to be impossible, which now is either done, or is impossible. Then *persons*, whose testimony one must use, especially those of them who have long been famed for holiness and virtue, often lead us into error by their authority. Lastly, the love of *opinions* and

² To acquaint us with all the writers on ecclesiastical history, was the professed object of Sev. Walth. Slüterus in his *Propylæum historicæ Christianæ*, Luncb. 1696, 4to, and of Casp. Sagittarius, *Introductio ad historiam eccles. singulasque ejus partes*; especially vol. 1st. [2 vols. 4to. Jena, 1694, 1718. A good account of the most important writers is given by G. J. Planck, *Introduction to theological science*, (in German,) vol. 2d. By J. A. Nüsselt and C. F. L. Simon, *Guide to a knowledge of the best works in every branch of theology*, (in German,) 2 vols. 8vo, 2d ed. Leipz. 1800-13. Valuable notices of the principal writers, are to be found in J. G. Walch, *Bibliotheca theol. selecta*, tomo 3tio, and in his *Historia eccles. Novi Test.* Also in the (German) *Church History* of J. M. Schröckh, vol. 1st, Introd. pt. iii. Tr.]

[A very useful view of the principal writers on ecclesiastical history is given by J. G. Dowling, M.A., in his *Introduction to the critical study of ecclesiasti-*

cal history. (Lond. 1838.) The earliest known ecclesiastical historian was Hegesippus, who wrote *Υπομνήματα τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πράξεων*, or *Commentaries of ecclesiastical affairs*, about the year 170, according to Cave. (*Hist. Lit.* Lond. 1688, p. 45.) Of this work, however, which was in five books, fragments only remain. The earliest extant ecclesiastical historian is Eusebius of Cæsarea, who wrote in the former half of the fourth century. But the father of ecclesiastical history, as now existing, was really Matthias Francowitz, or as he called himself, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus*. The vast compilation, intemperately penned by himself and his coadjutors, in favour of Protestantism, and known as the *Centurie Maydeburgenses*, gave rise to a work, similarly extensive, by Caesar Baronius, in favour of Romanism. Upon one, or both, of these two great party histories, have since been reared most works of a similar kind. Ed.]

doctrines, which have our own affections, often so constrains our minds, that even unconsciously we may give erroneous views of facts. This triple servitude must, therefore, to our utmost power, be driven from the mind.

§ 19. From this standard, and from other precepts equally indisputable and necessary, how widely those have strayed, in every age, who have employed themselves in these pursuits, is not unknown. I may set aside the many who think themselves great historians because they have the luck of good memories, and say nothing of others who are influenced not by the love of truth, but by that of their own interests, and very few remain whose veracity is absolutely proof against either the sect to which they are devoted, or the venerable name of ancient writers, or the influence of their times. In our age especially, with many, the force of the times and of opinions is incredible. Hence those arguments, which so often occur in the books of learned men: *One is bound to think so: therefore it must be considered that the ancient Christians thought no otherwise. One must live thus according to Christ's injunction: therefore we cannot doubt that the earlier Christians lived thus. This is not now done: therefore neither did it formerly happen.*

§ 20. From these, and other faults, which we pass over, if those be free, who undertake the holier branch of history, it cannot fail of being very useful to the human race, especially to such as are entrusted with the care of sacred things. He who shall attentively consider the many, the so varied and bitter chances which the Christian religion has happily surmounted, will undoubtedly find himself strengthened in mind, and excellently fortified against the menaces, cavils, and stratagems of ungodly men. The so many illustrious examples, with which this history is filled, make wonderfully for the kindling of piety, and the instilling of God's love into sluggish minds. Those astonishing changes of affairs, often sprung from small beginnings, exhibited by every age, conspicuously declare as well the governance of God's providence, as the inconstancy and vanity of human things. Nor is the profit light of knowing the origins of the many silly opinions, superstitions, and errors, by which the Christian world is yet oppressed in numerous lands. For this knowledge aids greatly in understanding the truth, loving, and resolutely keeping it. Of the pleasure to be drawn from these, and other things, I shall say nothing.

§ 21. Those particularly who are entrusted with the

education of others, and the conducting of sacred affairs, may thence obtain great facilities for acquiring the wisdom which they cannot do without. Here, the numerous falls of men, otherwise great, show what is to be shunned, or the sacred city's peace will be disturbed: there, numbers of uncommon and praiseworthy deeds lay down a pattern which all ought to follow. For the combating of errors also, whether strong from age, or recent, nothing can be found, except Holy Scripture and sound reason, better than this history. Other advantages from this study I pass over, because they will soon strike any one who enters upon it, nor do I mention its utility to those who are employed upon some different branch of learning, especially if this be jurisprudence.

§ 22. A twofold form of teaching is necessary in ecclesiastical history, the one *external*, the other *internal*. A long and continuous narration, extending over many ages, must, indeed, be distributed into certain intervals of time, as well for enabling learners to understand and remember it, as for the sake of order. The time, however, may be variously divided. We prefer to other ways its usual distribution into centuries, because it pleases most people, although it is not without its peculiar difficulties.

§ 23. But of these difficulties no very small part will be removed, if, besides those greater intervals, which are defined by certain remarkable changes in affairs, we part the whole time that has elapsed from the rise of Christianity to ourselves. It seems best, accordingly, to comprise this entire history in four books. The *first* will unfold the church's fates from her very beginnings to Constantine the Great. The *second* will exhibit what has happened to the Christian commonwealth from Constantine's age to the times of Charlemagne. The third will run down from Charlemagne to that age in which oppressed truth was recalled to light in Germany, by the services of Luther. The *fourth* and last will extend from Luther to our own times.

§ 24. Moreover ecclesiastical history treats, as we have already seen, of various distinct, but kindred *subjects*; which may properly be arranged under separate heads. Historians have adopted different classifications; such as their fancies or their designs in writing pointed out. The distribution, which we prefer, has been already indicated, and need not here be repeated.

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
UNDER THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK I.
CONTAINING
THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
FROM
THE BIRTH OF CHRIST,
TO
CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

CENTURY FIRST.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS STATE OF THE WORLD AT THE BIRTH OF OUR SAVIOUR.

§ 1. State of the Roman empire.—§ 2. Its evils.—§ 3. Its advantages.—§ 4. Then in peace.—§ 5. Other nations.—§ 6. All were idolaters.—§ 7. They worshipped different gods.—§ 8. They were tolerant.—§ 9. Most of their gods were deceased heroes.—§ 10. Pagan worship.—§ 11. It was confined to times and places.—§ 12. The mysteries.—§ 13. Paganism not the parent of virtue.—§ 14. Its votaries sunk in vice.—§ 15. How supported by the priests.—§ 16. The Roman and Grecian religions.—§ 17. The mixed religions of the provinces.—§ 18. Religions beyond the Roman empire classed.—§ 19. Philosophers unable to reform the world.—§ 20. The oriental and Grecian philosophy.—§ 21. Some philosophers subverted all religion.—§ 22. Others debased it ; e.g. Aristotelians.—§ 23. Stoics.—§ 24. Platonics.—§ 25. The Eclectics.—§ 26. Use of this chapter.

§ 1. GREAT part of the world, when God put on the man, obeyed the Roman people. They ruled remoter nations, either by governors and presidents sent from Rome, but not for life, or let them use their own kings and institutions, though in such a way as kept up respect for the majesty and supreme power of the Roman state. The Roman senate and people themselves, though all appearance of liberty was not lost, really served a single man, *Augustus*, decorated with the offices of emperor, *pontifex maximus*, censor, tribune of the people, pro-consul ; in

a word, with every thing that had any degree of national dignity and importance¹.

§ 2. The Roman government, if we regard only its form and laws, was sufficiently mild and equitable². But from the injustice of presidents and nobles, their eagerness to enrich themselves; the popular anxiety not only to preserve acquisitions, but also to make fresh ones; the avarice besides of publicans, by whom the state revenues were usually farmed³, infinite grievances pressed upon the subjects. Those vices of magistrates and publicans despoiled the people of money and effects; while this anxiety not only occasioned many other evils, but also required numerous armies in the provinces, undoubtedly to the great oppression of their inhabitants, and stirred up almost perpetual wars.

§ 3. Still this widely extended dominion of one people, or rather of one man, was attended with several advantages. *First*, it brought into union a multitude of nations, differing in customs and languages. *Secondly*, it gave freer access to the remoter nations⁴. *Thirdly*, it gradually civilized the barbarous nations; by introducing among them the Roman laws and customs. *Fourthly*, it spread literature, the arts, and philosophy, in countries where they were not before cultivated. All these greatly aided the ambassadors of our Lord, in fulfilling their sacred commission⁵.

§ 4. When Jesus Christ was born, the Roman world was much freer from commotions, than it had been for many years. For, though I cannot agree with such as think, after Orosius, the temple of Janus to have been then shut, and all the globe at peace⁶; yet it admits of no doubt, that our Saviour came down to men, in an age, which cannot be compared with its predecessor, without being called eminently peaceful. According to

¹ See Aug. Campianus *de Officio et potestate magistratuum Romanorum, et jurisdictione*, lib. i. cap. 1. § 2. p. 3, &c. Geneva, 1725, 4to. [*Memoirs of the court of Augustus*, by Thos. Blackwell, vol. i. ii. 4to. Edinb. 1753. Schl.]

² See Sir W. Moyle's *Essay on the constitution of the Roman government*, in his *Posth. works*, vol. i. p. 1—48. Lond. 1726, 8vo. Scip. Maffei, *Verona illustrata*, lib. ii. p. 65. [Pet. Giamone, *Histoire civile du royaume de Naples*, vol. i. p. 3, &c. Schl.]

³ [See P. Burmann, *de Vectigalibus*

populi Romani, cap. ix. p. 123, &c. Schl.]

⁴ See Nic. Bergier, *Histoire des grands chemins de l'empire Romain*, 2nd ed. Brussels, 1728, 4to, and Everard Otto, *de Tutela ciarum publicarum*, pt. ii. p. 314.

⁵ Origen, among others, acknowledges this: lib. ii. adv. Celsum, p. 79, ed. Cantabr. [See also Heilmann, *Comment. de florente literarum statu et habitu ad relig. Christi initia*. Schl.]

⁶ See Joh. Massoni, *Templum Jani, Christo nascente, resecratum*. Roterd. 1706, 8vo.

St. Paul himself, this peace was absolutely necessary to those whom Christ entrusted with his message to mankind⁷.

§ 5. Respecting other nations, not under the Roman power, from want of monuments one cannot say much that is clear and ascertained. Nor is it very necessary to our purpose: it is enough to understand one thing. The nations facing the rising sun were oppressed by a severer domination of kings or tyrants; to bear which more patiently, softness of body and mind, and even the religion which they professed, much conduced. Such as were, on the other hand, in the northern regions, or not far from them, had far more liberty, which was protected no less by rigour of climate, and a habit of body sprung from it, than by their mode of life and religion⁸.

§ 6. All these nations were plunged in the grossest superstition. For, though the idea of one supreme God was not wholly extinct⁹, yet most nations, or rather all except the Jews, supposed that each country and province was subjected to a set of very powerful beings, whom they called gods, and whom the people, in order to live happily, must propitiate with various rites and ceremonies¹. These deities were supposed

⁷ See 1 Tim. ii. 1, &c.

⁸ Seneca, *de Ira*, lib. ii. cap. 16. Opp. tom. i. p. 36, ed. Gronovii: Fere itaque imperia penes eos fuere populos, qui minore caelo utuntur: in frigora, septentrionemque vergentibus inmansucta ingenia sunt, ut ait poeta, *suoque similitima caelo*.

⁹ [See Christopher Meiners' *Historia doctrinae de vero Deo, omnium rerum auctore atque rectore*. 2 parts, Lemgo. 1780, pp. 548, 12mo, where, from a critical investigation, proof is adduced, that the ancient pagan nations were universally ignorant of the Creator and Governor of the world; till Anaxagoras, about 450 years before Christ, and afterwards other philosophers, conceived that the world must have had an intelligent architect. *Tr.*]

¹ ["We conclude universally, that all that multiplicity of Pagan gods, which makes so great a show and noise, was really either nothing but several names and notions of one supreme Deity, according to its different manifestations, gifts, and effects in the world, personated, or else many inferior understanding beings, generated or created by one Supreme: so that one unmade, self-

existent Deity, and no more, was acknowledged by the more intelligent of the ancient pagans, (for of the sottish vulgar no man can pretend to give an account in any religion,) and consequently, the pagan polytheism or idolatry, consisted not in worshipping a multiplicity of unmade minds, deities, and creators, self-existent from eternity, and independent upon one Supreme; but in mingling and blending, some way or other, unduly, *creature-worship* with the *worship of the Creator*." (Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, Lond. 1678, p. 230.) Hence Faustus, the Manichean, branded both Jews and Christians as nothing better than schismatics from gentilism, maintaining that their doctrine of the divine unity was really derived from the heathens. Julian, the apostate, also maintained one common Creator, with inferior gods under him, each having to administer a province of his own. (*Ibid.* 231. 274.) In India, Bp. Heber was admitted into a small square court in the fort of Chunar, containing a large slab of black marble, holden in the highest veneration as the actual seat of the Deity during nine hours in every day. On the opposite wall was "a rudely-

to differ materially from each other, in sex, power, nature, and offices. Some nations, indeed, went beyond others in impiety and absurdity of worship, but all were justly chargeable with neglect of reason, and extreme folly in matters of religion.

§ 7. Thus every nation had a class of deities peculiar to itself; over which one more powerful and venerable than the rest presided, yet even he must obey the laws of fate, or eternal necessity. The orientals had not, however, the same gods as the Gauls, Germans, and other inhabitants of the northern regions. The Grecian deities differed altogether from those of the Egyptians, who had no hesitation in adding to the gods, animals, plants, and I know not what works of nature and art besides². Each nation likewise had its own method of worshipping and propitiating the gods, differing widely from religious practices elsewhere. But from ignorance and other causes, the Greeks and Romans maintained, that *their* gods were universally worshipped: and therefore called foreign deities by the names of their own. It can scarcely be said how much darkness and confusion this opinion has brought into the history of ancient religions, and how many errors it has produced in the books of very learned men³.

carved rose enclosed in a triangle," but no image was to be seen. (*Journey through the Upper Provinces of India*, Lond. 1828, i. 408.) Thus, in strict accuracy, polytheism cannot be charged either upon ancient or modern pagans: at all events, not upon their system, or its more enlightened adherents. The system, in fact, is an undue blending of *creature-worship with the worship of the Creator*. This is analogous to the Romish usage of praying to saints. *Ed.*]

² This was long since remarked by Athanasius, *Oratio contra gentes*. Opp. tom. i. p. 25. [See Le Clerc, *Ars critica*, pt. ii. sect. i. c. 13, § 11, and *Bibliothèque Choisie*, tom. vii. p. 84. W. Warburton's *Divine legation of Moses demonstrated*, tom. ii. p. 233, &c. And respecting the Egyptian gods, see P. E. Jablonsky, *Pantheon Aegyptiorum*, Frænf. ad Viadr. 1750, 8vo. F. S. von Schmidt, *Opuscula, quibus res antiquæ, præcipue Aegyptiacæ, explanantur*. 1765. 8vo. *Schl.*]

³ [Dr. Maclaïne here subjoins a long note, asserting that the gods, worshipped in different pagan countries, were so similar, that they might properly be

called by the same names. He therefore thinks Dr. Mosheim has overrated the mischief done to the history of idolatry by the Greek and Roman writers. But there was, certainly, little resemblance between Woden and Mercury, Thor and Jupiter, Friga and Venus; or between the Roman deities and Brahma, Vishnoo, Siva, and the other gods of Hindostan. And as the classic writers give very imperfect descriptions of foreign deities, and leave us to infer most of their characteristics from the names assigned them, it is evident that Dr. Mosheim's remark is perfectly just. *Tr.*]

[When Dr. Mosheim wrote, the world had not seen those elaborate works on pagan idolatry which have since been produced by Bryant and Faber. These scholars have laboriously and ingeniously traced heathen superstition to a common source, making it appear little else than the canonization of those eight ancestors of the modern world whom God mercifully saved in the ark. The Hindoo triad may, therefore, be taken as the three sons of Noah, called in the West, Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto.

§ 8. But this variety of gods and religions in the pagan nations, produced no wars or feuds among them; unless, perhaps, the Egyptians are an exception⁴. Yet even among them, the wars for their gods cannot properly be considered as sacred and religious. Each nation, without concern, allowed its neighbours to enjoy their own views of religion, and to worship their own gods in their own way. Nor need this tolerance greatly surprise us⁵. For they who regard the world as a great country divided into different provinces, each subject to a distinct order of deities, cannot despise the gods of other nations, and compel strangers to worship their own divinities. The Romans, in particular, though they would not allow the public religions to be changed or multiplied, yet gave their citizens entire liberty to follow privately the worship of other countries, and to honour with assemblies, feasts, temples, groves, and other things, those foreign deities whose rites had nothing inconsistent with domestic safety and institutions⁶.

§ 9. The greater part of the gods of all nations were ancient heroes, famous for their achievements and worthy deeds, as kings, generals, and founders of cities; or even females, who had gained renown by something accomplished or invented. Hence the gratitude of posterity raised them to the skies. To these, some added the more splendid and useful objects in the natural world: among which, the sun, moon, and stars, being pre-eminent, received worship from nearly all; and some were not ashamed to pay divine honours to mountains, rivers, trees, the earth, the ocean, the winds, and even to diseases, to virtues and vices, and to almost every conceivable object,—or, at least, to the deities supposed to preside over these objects⁷.

Friga is evidently the same name as Rhea. Let the pagan system, in every age and country, be considered as one, (which it really seems to be,) and its prevalence may easily be understood. It will stand forth as a corruption of the patriarchal religion strictly analogous to the Romish corruption of Christianity. *Et.*]

⁴ See what Laur. Pignorius has collected on this subject, in his *Expositio mensæ Isiæce*, p. 41, &c.

⁵ [Though extolled by Shaftesbury, among others, *Characteristics*, vol. ii. p. 166, and vol. iii. p. 60. 86, 87. 154, &c. *Schl.*]

⁶ See Corn. à Bynekershoockh, *Dis-*

sert. de cultu peregrinæ religionis apud Romanos, in his *Opuscula*, L. Bat 1719, 4to. [Warburton's *Divine Legation of Moses*, vol. i. p. 307. Compare Livy, *Hist. Rom.* lib. xxv. 1, and xxxix. 18, and Valer. Max. i. 3. *Schl.* See also N. Lardner, *Credib. of Gospel hist.* pt. i. bk. i. c. 8, § 3—6. *Tr.*]

⁷ See the learned work of G. J. Vossius, *de Idololatria*, lib. i.—iii. [and *La Mythologie et les fables expliquées par l'Histoire*, par l'Abbé Baniér, Paris, 1738—40, 8 vols. 12mo, and Fr. Creutzer's *Symbolik u. Mythologie der alten Völker, besonders der Griechen*. Leipz. u. Darmst. 1810—12, 4 vols. 8vo. *Tr.*]

§ 10. The worship of these deities consisted in numerous ceremonies, with sacrifices, offerings, and prayers. The ceremonies were for the most part absurd and ridiculous; and throughout, debasing, obscene, and cruel. The sacrifices and offerings varied according to the nature and offices of the different gods¹. Most nations immolated animals, and some likewise human beings², a most hideous practice. Their prayers might be truly called insipid, and void of true piety, whether one considers their form or matter³; over this whole worship presided pontiffs, priests, and servants of the gods, divided into many classes; whose business it was, to see that nothing should be done improperly. These people were supposed to enjoy the friendship and familiar converse of the gods; and they basely abused their authority to impose on the people.

§ 11. The religious worship of most nations, was not only confined to certain *places* and temples⁴, but also to certain *times* and stated days. In the temples were placed statues and figures of their gods; and these representations were thought animated in an inexplicable manner by the deities themselves. For, senseless as these worshippers of fictitious gods really were, they nevertheless did not choose to have the credit of adoring lifeless images, brass, stone, and wood, but the deity which the statue represented, whom they considered present in it, if its dedication had been properly performed⁵.

§ 12. Besides this common worship, to which all had free access, there were, among both orientals and Greeks, certain recondite and concealed rites, called *mysteries*; to which very few were admitted. Candidates for initiation had first to give satisfactory proof to the Hierophants of their good faith and patience, by various most troublesome ceremonies. When initiated, they could not divulge any thing they had seen, without exposing their lives to imminent danger⁶. Hence it is, that

¹ See J. Saubertus, *de Sacrificiis Veterum*; republished by T. Crenius, L. Bat. 1699, 8vo.

² See H. Columna, *ad Fragmenta Ennii*, p. 29; and J. Saubertus, *de Sacrificiis Vet.* cap. 21, p. 455.

³ See Matt. Browerius *de Nieddeck, de Adorationibus veterum Populorum*, Traj. 1711, 8vo. [and Saubertus, *ubi supra*, p. 343, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ [“Some nations were without temples, such as the Persians, Gauls, Ger-

mans, and Britons, who performed their religious worship in the open air, or in the shady retreats of consecrated groves.” *Macl.*]

⁵ Arnobius, *adv. Gentes*, lib. vi. p. 254, ed. Herald. Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, lib. vii. c. 33. Opp. tom. vii. p. 161, ed. Benedict. Julian, *Misopogon*, p. 361, ed. Spanheim.

⁶ See Jo. Meursius, *de Mysteriis Eleusyniis*; and David Clarkson, *Discourse on Liturgies*, § iv.

the interior of these rites is, at this day, little known. Yet we know, that in some of the mysteries, many things were done repugnant to modesty and decency; and from all of them, the discerning might easily see, that the deities adored had been men, men more distinguished for their vices than their virtues⁵.

§ 13. The whole pagan system had not the least efficacy to produce and cherish true virtue in the soul. For in the *first* place, the gods and goddesses, to whom religious homage was publicly paid, were patterns rather of vices and iniquities than of virtues⁶. They were considered, indeed, as superior to mortals in power, and as exempt from death; but in all things else, as on a level with us. In the *next* place, the ministers of this religion, neither by precept nor example, exhorted the people to lead honest and virtuous lives; but gave them to understand, that all worship of the gods was comprised in rites and institutions received from former generations⁷. And *lastly*, current doctrines, respecting the rewards of good men, and the punishments of bad ones after this life, were some of them dubious and uncertain, and others more adapted for promoting vice than

⁵ [Cicero, *Disput. Tusculan.* lib. i. cap. 13, [and *de Leg.* cap. 24. Varro, cited by Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, lib. iv. cap. 31. Eusebius, *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. ii. c. 3. *Schl.*].—[See also Warburton's *Divine legat.* vol. i. lib. ii. § 4, who was confronted by J. Leland, *Advantages and necessity of the Christian Rec.* vol. i. ch. 8, 9. p. 151—190.—C. Meiners, *über die Mysterien der Alten*; in his *Miscel. philos. works*, vol. iii. Leipz. 1776. The Baron de Sainte Croix, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la religion secrète des anciens peuples*, &c. Paris, 1784, 8vo, and (P. J. Vogel's) *Briefe über die Mysterien*; which are the 2nd collection of *Letters on Freemasonry*, Nuremb. 1784, 12mo. It has been maintained that the design of at least some of these mysteries, was, to inculcate the grand principles of natural religion; such as the unity of God, the immortality of the soul, the importance of virtue, &c. and to explain the vulgar polytheism as symbolical of these great truths. But this certainly needs better proof. It is more probable that the later pagan philosophers, who lived after the light of Christianity had exposed the abominations of polytheism, resorted to this subterfuge in order to vindicate the character of their predecessors. *Tr.*]

⁶ Ovid, *de Tristibus*, lib. ii. v. 287, &c. Quis locus est templis angustior? hæc quoque vitet,

In culpam si qua est ingeniosa suam. Cum steterit Jovis rede, Jovis succurrit in cede,

Quàm multas matres fecerit ille Deus. Proxima adoranti Junonia templa subibit,

Pellicibus multis hanc doluisse Deam. Pallade conspectâ, natum de crimine virgo

Sustulerit quare queret Erichthonium.

[Compare Plato, *de Leg.* lib. i. p. 776, and *de Republ.* lib. ii. p. 430, &c. ed. Ficini. Isocrates, *Encom. Basilidis*, Oratt. p. 462, and Seneca, *de Vita beata*, cap. 26. *Schl.*]

⁷ See J. Barbeyrac, Preface to his French translation of Puffendorf's *Law of nature and nations*, § vi. [Yet there were some intelligent pagans who had better views, as Socrates and the younger Pliny. The latter, in his *Panegyric on Trajan*, cap. iii. n. 5, says: Animadverto,—etiam Deos ipsos, non tam accuratis adorantium precibus, quàm innocentia et sanctitate letari: gratioremque existimari, qui delubris eorum puram castamque mentem, quàm qui meditatam carmen intulcrit. *Schl.*]

virtue⁸. Hence most of the wiser people, about the time when Christ was born, contemned and ridiculed all these things.

§ 14. Hence a universal corruption of morals prevailed, and crimes, which at this day cannot be named with decency, were then practised with entire impunity⁹. Those who would see proof of this, may read Juvenal and Persius among the Latins, and Lucian among the Greeks: or if this appear too much trouble, it will be enough to think merely of the gladiatorial shows, the flagitious loves of boys, and abominable lusts; the licence of divorce, both among Greeks and Romans; the practice of exposing infants, and procuring abortion; the stews consecrated to gods: all which no law forbade¹.

§ 15. Men, who were not altogether dull and slow, saw through the deformity of these religions, but the crafty priests had two methods of opposing them. First, they talked of miracles and prodigies which had occurred in the temples and before the statues of the gods and heroes, and which were daily witnessed still; then they laid claim to divination and oracles, by which the gods foreshowed future events. In both cases, priestly cunning shamefully imposed upon the people; nor did this escape discerning minds². But it was needful to laugh with

⁸ [What the Greeks and Romans said of the Elysian Fields, was not only fabulous in its very aspect, but it held out the prospect of voluptuous pleasures, opposed to true virtue. The more northern nations promised a happy immortality only to those who distinguished themselves by a martial spirit and the slaughter of numerous foes; that is, to the enemies of mankind. And the eternal bliss, which they promised to these warriors, was only a continued indulgence in vile lusts. How could such hopes excite to virtue?—Moreover, the doctrine of even these rewards and punishments, was not an article of faith, among the Greeks and Romans; but every one believed what he pleased concerning it: and, at the time of Christ's birth, the followers of Epicurus were numerous, and while many denied, most others doubted, the reality of future retribution. Polybius, *Hist. lib. v. 54*. Sallust, *Bell. Catil.—Schl.*]

⁹ Cyprian, *Epist. i. p. 2*, ed. Baluz. describes at large the debased morals of the pagans. See also Cornelii Adami *Exercit. de malis Romanorum ante predicationem Evangelii moribus*; in his *Escr-*

citt. Exercit. Exercit. v. Gröning. 1712, 4to. [and, what is still better authority, St. Paul to the Romans, chap. i. *passim*. Tr.]

¹ [On the subject of this and several preceding sections, the reader may find satisfactory proof in that elaborate and candid work: *The advantage and necessity of the Christian Revelation, shown from the state of religion in the ancient heathen world*; by J. Leland, D.D. 2nd ed. Dublin, 1765. 2 vols. 8vo. Tr.]

² [Schlegel here introduces a long note, showing that Dr. Mosheim, till towards the close of his life, did not utterly reject that common opinion of the ancients, that *evil spirits* sometimes aided the pagan priests, particularly in regard to their oracles. But Dr. Mosheim did, we are told by his pupil, come at last into the opinion now generally admitted, namely, that the pagan oracles were all mere cheats, proceeding from the craft of the priests. See Van Dale, *de Oraculis ethnicorum*: among his *Diss. Amstel. 1696, 4to*, and Bern. Fontenelle, *Histoire des oracles, 1687*, with the Jesuit, J. F. Baltus, *Réponse à l'histoire des oracles, &c. Strasb. 1707, 8vo*,

caution, if one would be safe. For the priests were in the habit of charging with treason to the gods, before a raging and superstitious populace, those who laid bare their frauds.

§ 16. At the time chosen by the Son of God for his birth among men, the Roman religion, as well as arms, pervaded a large part of the world. Of this religion he has a sufficient knowledge, who is not unacquainted with the superstitions of the Greeks². There are, however, some differences between them. For the Romans, to say nothing of institutions invented by Numa and others for political ends, had augmented Grecian fables by some Italic and Etrurian figments, besides giving to the gods of Egypt some sort of place among their own⁴.

§ 17. In the Roman provinces a new kind of religion gradually sprang up, compounded of that anciently professed by the people, and that of their conquerors. For these nations, who before their subjugation had their peculiar gods and religious rites, were persuaded by degrees to adopt many of the Roman usages. This was good policy in the Romans, whose interests were promoted by the extinction of those inhuman rites which prevailed in many quarters; and it was an object no less aided by popular levity there, than by the desire that prevailed to please their masters³.

§ 18. The most prominent religions beyond the bounds of the Roman empire, may be divided into two classes, the *civil* and the *military*. To the first class belong the religions of most of the oriental nations, especially of the Persians, the Egyptians, and the Indians. For, whoever carefully inspects these, will easily see their adaptation to political objects, as the protection of royal authority and majesty, the preservation of public tranquillity, the increase of civil virtues, and to no others. To the second class must be referred the religions of the northern nations. For all that was inculcated, among the Germans, Britons, Celts, Goths, and others, respecting the gods and the worship due to them, was evidently suited to awaken and cherish fortitude, ferocity, and contempt of life. A careful examination of these religions will fully verify these statements.

§ 19. No nation was so rude and barbarous, as to be completely without persons who saw the folly of these religions.

and *Suite de la Réponse*, §c. 1703, 8vo, Tr.]

³ See Dionys. Halicarn. *Antiquitatt. Romanor.* lib. vii. cap. 72, tom. i. p. 460. ed. Hudson.

⁴ See Sam. Petitus, *ad Leges Atticas*, lib. i. tit. i. p. 71. [Lactantius, *Divinarum Institut.* lib. i. c. 20. *Schl.*]

⁵ [Strabo, *Geograph.* lib. iv. p. 189, &c. *Schl.*]

But some of them were destitute of authority and means to remedy these evils, others had not will; all were left without sufficient wisdom for such an arduous undertaking. This can scarcely be better seen than from those attempts which Greek and Roman philosophers made against vulgar superstitions. Although they prescribed many things, not incorrectly, concerning God's nature and human duties, besides discussing sensibly enough the popular religion, yet they added to these things such wildness and absurdity, as clearly showed that it is God alone, and not men, who can teach truth without colouring and mistaking it.

§ 20. When the Son of God appeared among men, the general form of philosophising that reigned among nations, not altogether uncivilised, was twofold; namely, the *Grecian*, which was also adopted by the Romans; and the *oriental*, which had many followers in Persia, Syria, Chaldea, Egypt, and even among the Jews. The former was properly called *philosophy*: the latter, those who spoke Greek designated as *γνώσις*, that is, *knowledge*, namely *Οεω*, of God; because its followers pretended to restore the lost knowledge of the supreme Deity⁶. The friends of both were split into various sects vehemently disagreeing upon many subjects; yet with this difference, that all the sects of oriental philosophy set out from one principle, which kept them steady to some common positions, while the Greeks disagreed as to the very foundations of all wisdom.—Of the oriental philosophy, we shall give account hereafter: of the Grecian and its factions, notice will be taken here.

§ 21. Some of the Grecian sects declared open war against all religion: others, though opposed neither to a deity nor his worship, rather obscured, than threw light upon the truth. Of the former class were the *Epicureans*, and the *Academics*. The Epicureans maintained, that the world arose from chance; that the gods (whose existence they did not dare to deny) neither did, nor could, care for human affairs; that our souls were born and died; that *pleasure*⁷ was the governing principle, and the only

⁶ St. Paul mentions and disapproves both kinds of philosophy; namely, the Grecian, *Colos.* ii. 8, and the oriental, *or γνῶσις*, *1 Tim.* vi. 20. [Dr. Mosheim has been censured for his confident assertions, in regard to the existence and prevalence of an oriental philosophy, going under the name of *γνῶσις*,

so early as the days of Christ and his apostles. On this subject more will be said hereafter. *Tr.*]

⁷ ["The ambiguity of the word *pleasure*, has produced many disputes in the explication of the Epicurean system. If by *pleasure*, be understood only *sensual* gratifications, the tenet here advanced

reason why virtue should be loved. The Academies denied the possibility of arriving at certainty; and, therefore, disputed whether the gods existed or not; whether the soul is mortal, or survives the body; whether virtue is preferable to vice, or the contrary⁸. These two sects, when Jesus was born, were very numerous and influential; being favoured by men of rank especially, and by nearly all the opulent⁹.

is indisputably monstrous. But if it be taken in a larger sense, and be extended to intellectual and moral objects; in what does the scheme of Epicurus, with respect to virtue, differ from the opinions of those Christian philosophers, who maintain that *self-love* is the only spring of all human affections and actions?" *Macl.*]—Epicurus distinguished between *corporeal* pleasure and *mental*. But he accounted both *sensitive*; because he held the soul to be *material*. His conceptions of pleasure did not extend beyond *natural pleasures*; the chief of which, he supposed to be a calm and tranquil state of *mind*, undisturbed by any fear of God, or any solicitude about the future; and attended with freedom from bodily pain. His system, therefore, denied the very idea of *moral* or *religious* pleasures; and it required *atheism* as its foundation. See Stäudlin's *Geschich. d. Moralphilos.* p. 230, &c. Hanov. 1822, 8vo. *Tr.*]

⁸ [The Academies, or Platonists, became indeed sceptical; especially those of the Middle Academy. Some real Pyrrhonists, likewise, assumed the name of Academies. Still it is probable, the great body of Academies, like Cicero, who is accounted one of them, merely held that all human knowledge is *imperfect*; that is, falls short of certainty; that of course, we are obliged in all cases, to act upon *probabilities*; of which there are different degrees. *Tr.*]

⁹ The Epicureans were the more numerous of the two. See Cicero, *de Finibus bonor. et malor.* lib. i. cap. 7, lib. ii. cap. 14, and *Disput. Tuscul.* lib. v. cap. 10. Hence Juvenal, *Satyr.* xiii. v. 86, &c. thus complains of the many atheists at Rome:

Sunt in fortune qui casibus omnia
ponant,
Et nullo credant mundum rectore
moveri,
Naturâ volvente vices et lucis et anni:
Atque ideo intrepidi quæcunque al-
taria tangunt.

[Dr. Mosheim, in these sections, is giving the dark side of pagan philosophy. Like his other translators, therefore, I would aim so to soften his pictures, that the less informed reader may not be misled. This, I am persuaded, Dr. Mosheim would himself approve; as may be inferred from the following long note, inserted apparently for such a purpose, in the parallel passage of his *Commentarii de Rebb. Christ. ante Constant.* p. 17, 18. "I cannot agree with those who maintain, that every one of the philosophers of those times, even such as discoursed well on religious subjects, were hostile to all religion. I think those learned moderns have gone too far, who have endeavoured to prove, that every sect of the philosophers, either openly or covertly, aimed to rip up the foundations of all religion. Are we to believe, that not one of the many great and worthy men of those times, however free from ill intentions, was so fortunate as to make a proper use of his reason? Must all those who professed theism, and spoke sublimely of the divine perfections, be regarded as impostors, who said one thing, and meant another? Yet the celebrated and acute W. Warburton, to mention no others, lately expended much ingenuity and learning to bring us to such conclusions. See his very elaborate and noted work, entitled *The Divine Legation*, &c. vol. i. p. 332, &c. and p. 419, &c. He would have us think, that all the philosophers who taught the immortality of the soul, secretly denied it; that they held *nature* to be the only deity; and human souls to be particles, severed from the souls of the world, to which they return at the death of the body. But not to mention that he cites only Grecian philosophers, while other nations had their philosophers also, differing widely from the Grecian; the renowned author depends not on plain and explicit testimony, which seems requisite to justify so heavy a charge, but merely on conjec-

§ 22. To the second class, belong the *Aristotelians*, *Stoics*, and *Platonics*; none of whom, however, so treated of God, religion, and moral duties, as to be of much service to mankind. The god of *Aristotle* is like the principle of motion in a machine: a nature happy in contemplation, and ignorant of human things. A god of this kind, who differs little from those of *Epicurus*, there is no reason for either loving or fearing. Whether this philosopher held the soul to be mortal, or immortal, is at least doubtful¹. Now what solid and sound precepts of virtue and piety can that man give, who denies the providence of God; and not obscurely intimates that the soul is mortal?

§ 23. The god of the *Stoics* has a little more of majesty; nor does he sit idle above the heaven and stars. Yet he is described as a *corporeal* being, united to matter by a necessary connexion; and, moreover, subject to *fate*:—so that he can neither reward nor punish². That death was decreed to souls by this sect, no scholar is unaware. Now such doctrines take away the strongest motives to virtue. Wherefore, the moral system of the *Stoics*, though a body splendid and illustrious, has neither nerves nor limbs³.

§ 24. Plato passes for the wisest of all the philosophers, and

tures, on single examples, and on inferences from the doctrines held by certain philosophers. If this kind of proof be allowed, if single instances, and inferences, are sufficient to convict men of duplicity, when no shadow of suspicion appears in their language, who will be found innocent? Though but an ordinary man, and far inferior to Warburton, yet I could prove, that all the theologians in Christendom disbelieve, utterly, what they teach in public; and that they covertly aim to instil the poison of impiety into men's minds; if I might be allowed to assail them in the manner this learned writer assails the philosophers." *Tr.*]

¹ See the notes on my Latin translation of R. Cudworth's *Intellectual System*: tom. i. p. 66. 500; tom. ii. p. 1171, and Mich. Morgues, *Plan théologique du Pythagorisme*, tom. i. p. 75, &c.

² ["Thus is the Stoical doctrine of *fate* generally represented; but not more generally, than unjustly. Their *fatum*, when carefully and attentively examined, seems to have signified no more, in the intention of the wisest of that sect, than the plan of government

formed originally in the divine mind, a plan all-wise and perfect; and from which, of consequence, the Supreme Being, morally speaking, can never depart. So that when Jupiter is said by the Stoics to be subject to immutable *fate*, this means no more than that he is subject to the wisdom of his own counsels, and acts ever in conformity with his supreme perfections. The following remarkable passage of Seneca, drawn from the 5th chapter of his book *de Providentia*, is sufficient to confirm the explanation we have here given of the Stoical *fate*: *Ille ipse omnium conditor et rector, scripsit quidem fata, sed sequitur. Semper parat, semel jussit.*" *Macl.*]—This fine apology will not bear a strict scrutiny. The Stoics themselves differed in opinion; and they generally had indistinct notions. But most of them held *fate* to be rather a *physical*, than a *moral* necessity; though some of them, at times, confounded it with Jove, nature, or a pantheistic god, as Seneca does in the passage quoted. *Tr.*]

³ These remarks receive some illustration from my note on Cudworth's *Intel. Syst.* tom. i. p. 517.

not undeservedly. For he set over the universe a God great in liberty, power, and intelligence; he showed men besides both what to hope, and what to fear, after the body's death. Yet, to say nothing of the very slender foundations on which his whole doctrine rests, with its great obscurity, that supreme creator of the world, whom he praises, not only wants many virtues⁴, but is also contained in a certain place and space. His decisions upon the human soul and demons have an extraordinary tendency to produce and encourage superstition⁵. Nor will his system of morals command very high estimation, if we examine it in all its parts, and inquire into its first principles⁶.

§ 25. As in all these sects were many things inconsistent with right reason, joined to a fondness for striving and debate, some well-disposed and moderate men determined upon believing no one of them implicitly, but upon selecting from all, the better parts that were unquestionably reasonable, despising what remained. Hence originated in Egypt, and particularly at Alexandria, a new mode of philosophising, called the *eclectic*⁷. One Potamon of Alexandria has been represented as its author; but the subject has its difficulties⁸. That this sect flourished at Alexandria, in the age of our Saviour, is manifest

⁴ [He ascribed to God, neither omnipotence, nor omnipresence, nor omniscience. *Schl.*]—But Dr. Maclaine here enters his dissent. He says: "All the divine perfections are frequently acknowledged by that philosopher." I wish he had given proof of this assertion, if he was able to make it good. *Tr.*]

⁵ [He believed that God employs good and evil demons, in the government of the world; and that men can have commerce with these demons. A person believing this, may easily be led to regard idolatry as not altogether irrational. *Schl.*]

⁶ The defects of the Platonic philosophy are copiously, but not very accurately, depicted by Fran. Baltus, in a French work, *Défense des pères accusés de Platonisme*, Paris 1711, 4to. [Plato has, moreover, been accused of Spinozism. For Bale (*Continuation des pensées diverses sur la Comète*, &c. cap. 25.) and Gundling, (in *Otiis*, fasc. 2, and in *Gundlingianis*. Th. 43. 45.) tax him with confounding God with matter. But Zimmermann (*Opuscula*, tom. i. p.

762, &c.) and the elder Schellhorn (*Amœnitat. literar.* tom. ix. xii. and xiii.) have defended the character of Plato. *Schl.*]

⁷ ["The Eclectic philosophy is so called from its professing to select the better parts of the systems invented before it, and to digest these into one consistent doctrine." Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century*, Lond. 1833, p. 111. *Ed.*]

⁸ [J. Brucker, *Historia crit. philos.* tom. ii. p. 193, has shown, that in regard to the controversies maintained by Heumann, Haseus, and others, respecting this nearly unknown Potamon, the probability is, that he lived about the close of the second century; that his speculations had little effect; and that Ammonius is to be regarded as the founder of the Eclectic sect. Yet this will not forbid our believing, what Brucker himself admits, that there were some Grecian philosophers, as early as the times of Christ, who speculated very much as the Eclectics afterwards did; though the few followers they had, did not merit the title of a sect. *Schl.*]

from the Jewish Philo, who philosophised according to its principles⁹. These Eclectics held Plato in the highest estimation; but they unscrupulously modified his doctrines by incorporating what they pleased from the other philosophers¹.

§ 26. It will be easy to see what inference should be drawn from this account of the world's lamentable state, when Christ was born. All may learn from it that mankind, in that age thoroughly corrupt, stood in need of some divine teacher, who should not only imbue men's minds with indisputable precepts of religion and true wisdom, but also recall their erring steps into the way of virtue and piety. Nor will these observations profit less those who are not sufficiently aware how much protection and advantage Christ's advent brought to men, and how beneficially his religion acted upon all the circumstances of life. Many despise and speak ill of the Christian religion, because they do not know themselves indebted to it for all the blessings they enjoy.

⁹ [For he philosophised in the manner of Clemens Alex., Origen, and the other Christian doctors, who were certainly *Eclectics*. For the most part, he follows Plato: and hence many account him a pure Platonist. But he often commends the Stoics, Pythagoreans, and others, and adopts their opinions. *Schl.*]

¹ See Godfr. Olearius, *de Philosophia Eclectica*; James Brucker, and others. [On the philosophy, as well as the vulgar polytheism of the ancient pagans, the best work for the mere English reader, seems to be that already mentioned, N. Lander's *Advantage and necessity of the Christian revelation, shown from the state of religion in the ancient heathen world*, 2nd ed. 1765, 2 vols. 8vo.

—The history of philosophy among the ancients has not been critically and ably written in English, nor by Englishmen. Stanley's *Lives*, &c. 1655, 4to, is full of mistakes; and Enfield's *Abridgment of Brucker*, is quite superficial. The best general works are J. Brucker's *Historia critica philosophiæ*, Lips. 1741—67, 6 vols. 4to, and the more recent German works by Tiedemann, (7 vols. 8vo, 1791—96.) Buhle, (7 vols. 8vo, 1800.) Tennemann (12 vols. 8vo, 1798—1810.) and Rixner, 3 vols. 8vo, 1822. The history of moral philosophy, or ethics, is well treated by Cp. Meiners, (*krit. Geschichte*, 2 vols. 8vo, 1800—1,) and C. F. Stäudlin, *Gesch. der Moralphilosophie*, 1822, p. 1055, 8vo. *Tr.*]

CHAPTER II.

THE CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS STATE OF THE JEWS AT THE
BIRTH OF CHRIST.

§ 1. Herod the Great then reigned.—§ 2. State of the Jews after his death.—§ 3. Their troubles and calamities.—§ 4. which were increased by their leading men. § 5. Their religion greatly corrupted, both among the common people.—§ 6. and among their teachers, who were divided into three sects.—§ 7. Their discussions.—§ 8. Their toleration of each other.—§ 9. The Essenes.—§ 10. The Therapeutic.—§ 11. Moral doctrines of these sects.—§ 12. Low state of religion among the people.—§ 13. The Cabbala, a source of error.—§ 14. Their form of worship debased by pagan rites.—§ 15. Causes of the corruption of the nation. § 16. Yet religion not wholly extinct.—§ 17. The Samaritans.—§ 18. State of the Jews out of Palestine.

§ 1. THE condition of the Jews, among whom the Saviour chose to be born, was little better than that of other nations. Their state was harassed rather than governed by Herod, for whom vices gained the surname of the Great, and who was really a tributary of the Roman people. This man, by cruelty, suspiciousness, wars, drew infinite hatred on himself, while he exhausted the wretched nation's wealth, by a mad luxury, a magnificence beyond his fortune, and immoderate largesses. Under his administration, Roman luxury and great licentiousness spread over Palestine¹. In religion, he was professedly a Jew; but he copied the manners of those who despise all religion.

§ 2. On this tyrant's death, the Romans gave half Palestine² to his son Archelaus for government, under the title of *Etarch*: the other half was divided between two other sons of Herod, Antipas and Philip. Archelaus copied his father's vices; wherefore, ten years after that prince's death, an accusation against him was brought by the Jews before Augustus, and he was de-

¹ See Christ. Noldii *Historia Idumæa*, in Havercamp's edit. of Josephus, tom. ii. p. 333, &c. Ja. Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. i. pt. i. p. 27, &c. H. Norris, *Cenotaph. Piscat.* ii. 6. H. Prédcaux, *Connexions*, &c. pt. ii. lib. viii. Chr. Cel-

larius, *Historia Herodum*, in his *Diss. Acad.* pt. i. and especially, the Jewish historian, Fl. Josephus, in his *Wars of the Jews*.

² [Viz. Judea, Samaria, and Idumæa. Tr.]

prived of his authority³. The countries that he had governed were now reduced to the form of a province; and annexed to Syria. This political change brought infinite uneasinesses and calamities on the Jews, to the ultimate ruin and subversion of their nation.

§ 3. The Romans did not, indeed, wholly prohibit the Jews from retaining their national laws, and the religion established by Moses. Their religious affairs were still conducted by a High Priest, with priests and Levites under him; and by their national senate or Sanhedrim. The exterior of their worship, with a few exceptions, remained unaltered. But it can be scarcely told, how many evils the wretched people underwent from the very presence of the Romans, whom they thought polluted and detestable; how many from the avarice and cruelty of the governors, how many from the frauds and injuries of the publicans. Unquestionably, those lived more comfortably who were subject to the other two sons of Herod.

§ 4. But the Romans left nothing of liberty or happiness for the Jews, that was not intercepted by the crimes and vices of those among themselves, who set up for their defenders. The chiefs of their nation, the high priests, it is clear from Josephus, were most abandoned persons, whose dignity had been either gained by money, or by compliances that bespoke an irreligious mind, and who maintained their ill-acquired authority by every sort of crimes. The other priests, and all those who held any considerable office, were not much better. The common people, tempted by these examples, rushed headlong upon iniquities of all kinds, until perpetual robberies and seditions called for vengeance both from God and men⁴.

§ 5. Two religions then flourished in Palestine, the *Jewish*, and the *Samaritan*; between the followers of which a deadly hatred prevailed. The nature of the former is set forth in the Old Testament. But in our Saviour's age, it had lost much of its primitive form and character. The people, universally, were infected with certain prevalent and pernicious errors: the more learned fiercely contended on points of the greatest moment. All looked for a deliverer; not, however, such a one as

³ [Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. xvii. cap. 13, and *de Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. cap. 6. *Schl.*—Archelaus was additionally punished by the confiscation of all his property, and by banishment to Vienne, in

Gaul. *Ed.*]

⁴ [See Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* lib. v. cap. 13, § 6; and Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. i. c. 16. *Schl.*]

God had promised, but a powerful warrior, and a vindicator of their national liberties⁵. None carried religion farther than observance of the rites prescribed by Moses, and of certain external duties towards the Gentiles. All excluded the rest of mankind from the hope of salvation; and of course, whenever they dared, treated them with inhumanity and hatred⁶. Besides drawing corruption from these most fruitful sources, they entertained various absurd and superstitious opinions, concerning the divine nature, genii, magic, and other things, partly brought home by their ancestors from the Babylonian captivity, partly imported by themselves from the neighbouring Egyptians, Syrians, and Arabians⁷.

§ 6. The more learned, who laid claim to an exact knowledge of the law, and of divine things, were divided into various sects and parties⁸; among which, *three* left the rest far behind in

⁵ [This is proved by J. Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, tom. v. cap. 10. That not only the Pharisees, but all Jews, of whatever sect, both in and out of Palestine, were expecting a Messiah, is shown by Dr. Mosheim, in his *Commentt. de Rebb. Christ.* &c. p. 40, from the following texts, John i. 20. 25; x. 24, &c.; xii. 34; Matt. ii. 4—6; xxi. 9; xxvi. 63, &c. *Schl.*]

⁶ [Hence other nations, not without reason, accounted the Jews as enemies of mankind. See the examples collected by J. Elsner, *Observat. Suor. in N. T.*, tom. ii. p. 274. *Schl.*]

⁷ [See Th. Gale, *Observ. ad Jamblichum, de Myster. Egypt.* p. 206; and G. Sale, Preface to his Eng. transl. of the *Koran*, p. 72. Even Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* lib. iii. c. 7, § 2, admits that the Jewish religion was corrupted among the Babylonians. *Schl.*]

⁸ Besides the three more noted sects, there were others, unquestionably, among the Jews. The *Herodians* are mentioned in the sacred volume; the *Gadonites*, by Josephus; and other sects by Epiphanius, and by Hegesippus in Eusebius; all of which cannot be supposed to be mere fictions. [Dr. Mosheim's additional remarks on this subject, in his *Comment. de Rebb. Chr. ante C. M.* p. 43—45, well deserve insertion here. They are as follows: "To vindicate my assertion, that Epiphanius's account of the Jewish sects, in the beginning of his book *de Hæresibus*, is not, probably, altogether untrue; I will offer

a conjecture, which, the more I consider it, the more important it appears. I propose it for the consideration of the learned. It may, perhaps, serve to remove some obscurities from ancient ecclesiastical history. Epiphanius states, that there was among the Jews a sect of *Hennerobaptists*, who had this peculiarity, that they washed themselves daily. The same sect is mentioned by an ancient writer, Hegesippus, quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. cap. 22, and by Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 245, ed. Jebb, though the latter abridges the name, calling them *Baptists*. Nor is this sect omitted in the Index of Heresies, falsely ascribed to Jerome. The author of the *Clementina*, Homil. ii. c. 23, says, The founder of the sect was named John, and he had twelve apostles, and thirty chief men, to aid him. The same account occurs in the *Epitome gestorum Petri*, § 20, which is subjoined to the *Clementina*. Either no credit is due to any ancient history, or these numerous and very ancient witnesses, who cannot be suspected of fraud or ignorance, must be believed when they assert, that there was a sect among the Jews, called *Hennerobaptists*. Epiphanius's whole story, therefore, is not to be accounted fabulous.

"The descendants of these *Hennerobaptists*, I suspect, are still existing. The learned well know that there is, in Persia and India, a numerous and wide spread community, who call themselves *Mendai Ijahi, Disciples of John*. The

number and authority : namely, the *Pharisees*, the *Sadducees*, and the *Essenes*. The two first are often mentioned in the Scrip-

Europeans call them *Christians of St. John*; because they have some slight knowledge of Christ. By the oriental writers, they are called *Sabbi* or *Sabbiin*. Concerning them, Ignatius a Jesu, a Carmelite monk, who lived long among them, has written a book, entitled, *Narratio originis, rituum et errorum Christianorum S. Johannis*, &c. Rome, 1652, 8vo. It is no contemptible performance, and contains many things deserving attention ; though it is ill-digested, and unpolished in its style. Besides this, Ignatius, Bart. Herbelot, (in *Biblioth. Orient. voce Sabi*.) Asseman, (*Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vat.*) Thevenot and Tavernier, (in their *Travels*.) Engelb. Kämpfer, (*Amenitatt. exot. fasc. ii. cap. 11*.) and very recently, Fourmont, (*Hist. of Paris. Acad. of Inscriptions*.) and others, have written largely concerning these people. Th. Sig. Bayer proposed writing a book respecting them, which, perhaps, was unfinished at his death. The origin and true character of this sect are still unsettled. That they cannot be classed among Christians, is now clear. For, what they know of Christ, they have learned from the Chaldean Christians, among whom many of them live ; nor do they worship or honour Christ. Most of the moderns incline to regard them as descended from those *Sabians*, who are so often mentioned in the *Koran* of Mahomet, and by Maimonides. But their customs, and their doctrines, are wholly different from those attributed to the *Sabians* ; and from their being called *Sabians* by the Mahometans, nothing can be inferred ; because it is well known that the Arabians apply this name to all who reject their religion.

“I am inclined to look upon these *Christians of St. John*, as descendants of those *Hemerobaptists*, who were a Jewish sect, about the time of Christ. For this opinion, I offer the following arguments. *First*, They profess to be Jews ; and say, their ancestors lived on the banks of the Jordan, whence they were driven by the Mahometans. This argument, I consider as overthrowing the hypothesis, which makes them to be *Sabians*. *Secondly*, They place their dependence for pardon and salvation on their frequent bodily ablutions ; which was the distinguishing error of the *Hemerobaptists*.

At this day, the *Disciples of John*, as they call themselves, are solemnly baptized by their priests, but once a year ; whereas, the *Hemerobaptists* daily purified themselves with water. But it is a fixed principle with them all, to this day, that the oftener they baptize, the holier and more happy are they ; and they, therefore, would all receive baptism every month, nay, every day, if they could. The avarice of their priests, who will not baptize them without a fee, has rendered the repetition of the rite less frequent. *Thirdly*, The founder of this sect, like that of the *Hemerobaptists*, was named John ; and has left a book which is preserved with reverence, as being divine. It is commonly supposed, that this John was John the *Baptist*, Christ's forerunner, mentioned in the Scriptures. Hence many conclude that the *Sabians* are descended from the disciples of John the *Baptist*. So thought Ignatius a Jesu, *Narratio de Chr. S. Joh. &c.* cap. 2, p. 13, &c. But what this sect relate of their John, as stated by Ignatius himself, clearly show him to be diverse from the *Baptist*. For they deny that their John suffered death under Herod ; they say he died a natural death, in a town of Persia, called Sciuster, and was buried in the adjacent fields of that town. They state also, that he had a wife, and four children. Only a few of the things they relate of their John accord with what our Scriptures relate of John the *Baptist* ; and these few things, like what they also say of Christ, they doubtless learned from those Christians with whom they associated to avoid the oppressions of the Mahometans ; and finding these things not inconsistent with their faith, and being unable, from their extreme ignorance, to refute them, they embraced and still retain them. What degree of weight this supposition of mine deserves, will better appear when the sacred books of this people, and especially the book said to be written by their founder John, shall be published. These were, a few years since, introduced into the king's library at Paris ; so that we may hope the learned will, sooner or later, have access to them.”—These sacred books of the *Sabians* of Hedshar in Persia, have been examined with considerable care ; see among others M. Norberg, *de religione et ling. Sabæorum*,

tures: a knowledge of the *Essenes*, we owe to Josephus and Philo. These principal sects agreed, indeed, generally upon those things without which the Jews' religion can no wise stand; but respecting questions of the highest importance, even such as are connected with human salvation, they were engaged in endless contentions. From these how much mischief flowed upon the rude and unlettered populace, any one will readily discern.

§ 7. They disagreed first, respecting the *law* itself, or the rule which God had given them. The Pharisees added to the *written* law, another, or the unwritten, delivered and handed down by word of mouth⁹. This the *Sadducees* and *Essenes* spurned, holding to the written law alone. They differed also respecting the *import of the law*. For while the Pharisees sought a *double sense* in Scripture, one obvious and of the *words*, another recondite and of the *things*, the *Sadducees* taught that nothing is contained in the law besides that which the words imply. Differing from both, the *Essenes* generally considered the *words* of the law as in themselves quite unimportant, and the *things* expressed by them as images of sacred and heavenly things. To these, were added other contests of equal import-

in *Commentt. Societ. Reg. Scient.* Gotting. 1780. The most probable conclusion is, that this people are not to be classed among Jews, Christians, or Mahometans; but are of uncertain origin, and have a religion of their own, compounded of Judaism, Christianity, Parsism, and Islamism. For a list of the writers who treat of them, see Nösselts. *Anweisung*, &c. § 474; and Stäudlin's *kirchl. Geographie*, vol. ii. p. 705. *Tr.*]

[It was said, that when Moses returned from Sinai to his tent, "he brought both these laws with him, and delivered them unto the people of Israel in this manner. He called Aaron unto him, and first delivered to him *the text* which was to be *the written law*, and after that the interpretation of it, which was the *oral law*, in the same order as he received both from God in the mount. Then Aaron arising, and seating himself at the right hand of Moses, Eleazar and Ithamar, his sons, went next in, and being taught both these laws at the feet of the prophet, in the same manner as Aaron had been, they also arose and seated themselves, the one on the left hand of Moses, and the other on the

right hand of Aaron; and then the seventy elders, who constituted the *Sanhedrim*, or great senate of the nation, went in, and being taught by Moses both these laws in the same manner, they also seated themselves in the tent; and then entered in all such of the people as were desirous of knowing the law of God, and were taught in the same manner: after this, Moses withdrawing, Aaron repeated the whole of both laws, as he had heard it from him, and also withdrew; and then Eleazar and Ithamar repeated the same; and on their withdrawing, the seventy elders made the same repetition to the people then present; so that each of them, having heard both these laws repeated to them four times, they all had it thereby firmly fixed in their memories: and that they then dispersed themselves among the whole congregation, and communicated to all the people of Israel what had thus been delivered unto them by the prophet of God: that they did put the text into writing, but the interpretation of it they delivered down only by word of mouth to the succeeding generations."—Prideaux, *Connections*, Lond. 1720, i. 256. *Ed.*]

ance, especially on the law's punishments and rewards; which the Pharisees, referring them both to body and soul, carried beyond this life, but the Sadducees thought them bounded by it. The Essenes took a middle course, admitting future rewards and punishments, but confining them to their souls; bodies being considered as made of malignant matter for the imprisonment of souls¹.

§ 8. Although these factions disputed with each other upon points of so much moment, mutual injuries do not appear to have been inflicted by them on religious grounds. This forbearance, however, no one acquainted with those times will ascribe to generous and well-founded principles. The Sadducees depended for influence and authority upon the upper classes, the Pharisees upon the people. It was, therefore, scarcely possible with either sect to make a hostile attack upon the other, without very great hazard. If, too, they had attempted any movement of a political tendency, the Romans would unquestionably have inflicted no light punishment on those who broke the peace. The Sadducees, we may add, were well-mannered people, averse from all disturbance and altercation by the very discipline which they followed².

§ 9. The *Essenes* could more easily avoid contention with the others, because they lived, for the most part, in retired places, and remote from intercourse with mankind. This sect, which was dispersed over Syria, Egypt, and the neighbouring countries, held religion to consist in silence, and meditation; and endeavoured, by a strict mode of life, and by various observances, borrowed, it would seem, from the Egyptians³, to attain a higher degree of virtue. Yet they were not all of the same sentiments. Some lived in celibacy; and made it their care to instruct and educate the children of others. Others

¹ [For an account of the three Jewish sects, see Ja. Trigland, *Synagoga Trium Scriptorum illustrium* (viz. Jo. Scaliger, Joh. Drusius, and Nicol. Serrarius,) *de Judæorum Sectis*, Delft, 1702, 2 vols. 4to. After these, Ja. Basnage, Hum. Prideaux, (in their Jewish histories,) and the authors of *Introductions to the books of the N. Test.* (and of works on Jewish Antiquities,) and many others, have described these sects, some more, and some less successfully. Mosheim, *de Rebb. Christianor. ante C. M.* p. 46.]

² [See *Commentt. de Rebb. Chr. ante C. M.* p. 48, where Dr. M. proves from Josephus, (*Antiq. Jud.* l. xviii. c. 1; and l. xiii. c. 10,) that the Sadducees were all men of wealth; and (from his *Bell. Jud.* l. ii. c. 8) that they had little sympathy for others. Dr. M. thinks he finds the picture of a Pharisee in the rich man described, Luke xvi. 19. *Seht.*]

³ See Lu. Holstenius, *Notes on Porphyry, de Vita Pythagoræ*, p. 11, ed. Kuster.

married wives—not to gratify their natural propensities, but solely to propagate the human race⁴. Those who lived in Syria, held that God may be propitiated by victims and sacrifices; although they must be offered in a very different manner from that which prevailed among the Jews: whence it appears, *they* did not reject wholly the Mosaic law in its literal sense. But such as dwelt in the desert parts of Egypt, denied that any other sacrifice was required by God than a composed mind given up to meditation upon heavenly things: which shows that *they* put an allegorical sense upon the whole Jewish law⁵.

§ 10. The *Therapeutæ*, of whom *Philo* wrote a whole book⁶, are commonly reckoned a branch of the *Essene* family; whence arose that well-known distinction of the *Essenes*, into *practical* and *theoretical*. But whether this classification is correct, may be doubted. For nothing is discoverable in the customs or institutions of the *Therapeutæ*, which evinces absolutely that they were a branch of the *Essenes*; nor has *Philo* so represented them. Who can deny that other fanatical Jews, besides *Essenes*, might have come together and formed a society? But I agree entirely with those who think the *Therapeutæ* to have been Jews, desirous of passing for true disciples of Moses, not Christians, or Egyptians. In reality, they were wild and melancholy enthusiasts, who led a life equally removed from the law of Moses, and right reason⁷.

⁴ [See Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 8, § 13. *Schl.*]

⁵ See Mosheim's note on Cudworth's Essay, *de vera Notione carnis Domini*, p. 4, subjoined to his *Intellectual System*.

⁶ *Philo*, *de Vita contemplativa*, in his Works, p. 889.

⁷ The principal writers concerning the *Therapeutæ*, are mentioned by J. A. Fabricius, *Lib. Sclutar. Evang. toti orbi eror.* cap. iv. p. 55. [The more ample account of the *Therapeutæ*, given by Dr. Mosheim, in his *Commentt. de Rebb. Chr.* &c. p. 55, &c. is thus abridged by Schlegel: "The *Therapeutæ* wished to pass for disciples of Moses, notwithstanding their wide departure from him. They gave up all their property, and betook themselves to retired situations, where they lived in solitary huts, without sacrifices, without any external worship, and without labour; mortifying their bodies by fasting, and their souls by unceasing contemplation, in order to bring their heaven-born spirits,

now imprisoned in bodies, into light and liberty, and fit them better for the celestial mansions after death. They assembled together every seventh day of the week; when, after hearing a discourse, and offering prayers, they ate together, feeding on salt and bread and water. This meal was followed by a sacred dance, which they protracted through the night, and till the dawn of day. At first, the men and women danced apart; afterwards, guided by inspiration, they danced together; and laboured by violent movements, outcries, songs, and voices, to express the love of God then working in their souls. Into such follies can human nature run, when ignorant of God; and of the nature of man. It is still debated whether these *Therapeutæ* were Christians, Jews, or heathen philosophers. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* l. ii. c. 17) regarded them as Christian monks, established in Egypt by St. Mark; and many Romish writers, to support the

§ 11. It was impossible that any one of these sects should inculcate and promote true piety and virtue. The *Pharisees*, as our Saviour often lays to their charge, disregarding internal purity, by a certain vain ostentation, and an austere kind of life, sought popular applause: they ascribed also more authority to the comments and institutions of older times, than to God's most holy precepts⁸. The *Sadducees* gave a stimulus to iniquity, and every lust, by discarding all future rewards and punishments. The *Essenes*, a fanatic and superstitious tribe, making piety consist in a holy sort of idleness, and contempt of the human race, loosened the ties that bind men to each other.

§ 12. When those who assumed the name and the prerogatives of *the wise* were involved in such darkness and alterations, who can doubt that the people's religion and piety were utterly debased? Sunk in total ignorance of heavenly things, the humbler classes reckoned upon pleasing God by due attention to the sacrifices, ablutions, and other ceremonies prescribed by Moses. From this two-fold source, flowed those polluted morals, and that profligate life, which characterized the greater part of the Jews, while Christ lived among them⁹. Hence our Saviour compared *the people* to sheep wandering without a shepherd¹; and *their teachers* to blind men, who would show a way to others which they do not know themselves².

High antiquity of monkery, defend this opinion. The whole of this controversy may be seen in the *Lettres pour et contre la fameuse question, si les solitaires appelés Thérapeutes, dont a parlé Philon le Juif, étoient Chrétiens*. Paris, 1712, 12mo. The chief advocates of this opinion are B. de Montfaucon, in the Notes to his French translation of Philo, and M. le Quien, *Christianus Oriens*, tom. ii. p. 332. On the other hand, Scaliger, Chamier, Lightfoot, Daillé, the two Basnages, Prideaux, Ittig, Budeus, Mosheim, Baumgarten, and recently J. A. Orsi, (*Hist. Eccles.* vol. i. p. 77.) and Mangey, (Preface to Philo's Works) have maintained, that they were *Jews*, and of the sect of *Essenes*. J. J. Lange, in a Dissert. published in 1721, maintained, upon very slender grounds, that they were *oriental philosophers*, of melancholy temperament, who had imbibed some Jewish notions. And Jablonsky, in an essay on the subject, accounts these solitaries *Egyptian priests*,

addicted to astrology and other sacred sciences of the Egyptians."—Dr. Mosheim pertinently observes, (*Com. de Rebb. &c.* p. 50.) "The Christian monks, who evidently originated in Egypt, borrowed their peculiarities from the *practical Essenes*; for nothing can be more similar, than the rules and regulations of the ancient monks, and those of the *Essenes*, as described by Josephus. On the other hand, the Christian *solitaires*, called *Eremites*, copied after the *theoretical Essenes*, or *Therapeute*." Tr.] — "*Essenes* in Egyptian, means *physicians* (of the soul); in Greek, Θεραπευταί, *Therapeute*." Hey's *Lectures in Dictionary*, i. p. 260. Ed.]

⁸ Matt. xxiii. 13, &c.

⁹ [A striking passage relative to the vicious lives of the Jews in our Saviour's time, occurs in Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* lib. x. c. 13, § 6. *Schl.*]

¹ Matt. x. 6; xv. 24.

² Matt. xv. 14. John ix. 39.

§ 13. To these stains on the character of the Jews when Christ came among them, must be added, upon all accounts, the fondness of many among them for the theory of the world's origin, which was taught by the oriental philosophers, and for the *Cabbala*³, as their nation calls it, that philosophy's most indubitable offspring. That many Jews *were* infected with this system, both the sacred books of the New Testament, and the early history of Christian affairs, will allow no one to disbelieve⁴. It is also certain, that the founders of several Gnostic sects were Jews. The followers of this philosophy must, necessarily, have differed from the other Jews, in their views of the God of the Old Testament, as also of Moses, of the creation, and of the Messiah. For they held the creator of the world to be a different being from the supreme God; and believed, that the Messiah was to destroy the domination of the former over the human race. From such opinions arose a monstrous system, widely different from the genuine religion of the Jews.

§ 14. The outward *forms* of worship established by Moses, were less corrupted than the other parts of religion. Yet very learned men have observed, that various rites were introduced even into the temple itself, for any traces of which we may vainly seek in the divine laws. After the Jews, in fact, saw the sacred rites, as well of the neighbouring nations, as of the Greeks and Romans, not a few ceremonies, with which the gods were worshipped, seemed so attractive, as to overcome the fear of adopting them, and of making them ornamental additions, as it were, to the rites of God's appointment⁵.

§ 15. Various *causes* may be assigned for this great corruption of a nation, which God had selected for his peculiar people. In the first place, their fathers had brought back with them from Chaldea and the adjacent countries into Palestine, many foolish and vain opinions, wholly unknown to the founders of

³ [“Although the word *Cabbala* be now restrained to signify the mystical interpretations of the Scriptures only, and in the common usage of speech now among the Jews, they alone are called *Cabbalists* who give themselves up to these dotages, yet in the true and genuine meaning of the word, the *Cabbala* extends to all manner of traditions, which are of the interpretative part of the Hebrew Scriptures, and the *Cabbalists* is

the general name of all those who professed the study and knowledge of them.”—Prideaux, *Connections*, i. 278. *Ed.*]

⁴ See J. C. Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebræica*, vol. ii. l. vii. c. i. § 9, p. 206.

⁵ See Joh. Spencer, *de Legibus ritual. veter. Hebræorum*, tom. ii. lib. iv. where he treats particularly of Jewish rites, borrowed from the Gentiles, and not to be found in the law of God.

the nation⁶. From the time too when Alexander the Great conquered Asia, the manners and opinions of the Greeks had found a passage not only to the Persians, Syrians, and Arabians, but likewise to the Jews, who were before unacquainted with literature and philosophy⁷. The journeys also commonly made by individuals of their nation into neighbouring countries, especially Egypt and Phœnicia, in quest of gain, caused various errors and fancies of the pagan nations to spread among the Hebrews. Lastly, *Herod* the Great and his sons, as likewise the Roman procurators and soldiers, undoubtedly planted in the country many foreign institutions and pollutions. Other causes will readily occur, to those who are not unskilled in Jewish history from the times of the Maccabees.

§ 16. But, notwithstanding their numerous faults, the people universally professed great fondness for the law of Moses, and carefully guarded it from the least curtailment: hence were erected over all the country sacred buildings, known by the Greek name of *Synagogues*, in which the people met for prayer, and for hearing public expounders of the law. Nor were the greater towns without schools, in which lettered men taught youth both divine and human knowledge⁸. These institutions, no one can doubt, must have done much to keep the law inviolate, and to check in some degree the growth of ripening vices.

§ 17. The Samaritans, who worshipped on mount Gerizim, were oppressed by the same evils as the Jews, though otherwise divided from them by a virulent hostility, nor were they less the authors of their own calamities. It appears from the history of those times, that Samaritan society was not behind Jewish in suffering from the machinations of factious men, although it had not, perhaps, an equal number of religious sects. That this people's religion was worse than the Jewish, Christ himself signifies⁹. Yet they seem to have had more correct views of the offices of the Messiah, than the greater part of the Jews¹. Upon the whole, although every thing related by the Jews of their opinions cannot be taken as the truth, yet it is undeniable, that the Samaritans adulterated the pure doc-

⁶ See Tho. Gale, on *Jamblichus de mysteriis Egyptiorum*, p. 206. Nor does Josephus conceal this fact, *Antiq. Jud.* l. iii. c. 7, § 2.

⁷ [Lo Clere, *Epist. Crit.* ix. p. 250. *Schl.*]

⁸ See Camp. Vitringa, *de Synagoga Vetere*, l. iii. c. v. and l. i. c. v. vii. [Prideaux, *Connections*, &c. pt. i. b. vi. anno 445. *Tr.*]

⁹ John iv. 22.

¹ John iv. 25.

trines of the Old Testament, with a profane alloy of pagan errors².

§ 18. The narrow limits of Palestine could not contain a nation so very numerous as the Jews. Hence, when our Saviour was born, there was hardly any considerable province, in which were not found many of that people who lived by traffic and other arts. These Jews, in countries out of Palestine, were protected against popular violence and injuries, by the laws, and by the injunctions of the magistrates³. Yet they were, in most places, exceedingly odious to the mass of people, on account of their striking singularity in religion and manners. Upon the whole, it came undoubtedly from a special providence of the great Supreme, that a people which had the guardianship of true religion, the worship, namely, of one God, should be spread over nearly all the earth, as if to shame superstition every where by their example, and in a manner to prepare the way for Christian truth.

CHAPTER III.

THE LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST.

§ 1. The birth of Christ.—§ 2. His childhood and youth.—§ 3. His precursor, John B.—§ 4. His subsequent life.—§ 5. He appoints twelve apostles, and seventy disciples.—§ 6. Reason of this number.—§ 7. Fame of Christ out of Judea.—§ 8. Success of his ministry.—§ 9. His death.—§ 10. His resurrection and ascension to heaven.

§ 1. So many and so virulent diseases of the human race, demanded a divine physician. From heaven, therefore, when Herod the Great's reign was near its close, did God's own Son descend in Palestine, and assuming human nature, became a

² The principal writers concerning the Samaritans, are enumerated by J. G. Carpzov, *Critica Sacra Vet. Test.* pt. ii. cap. vi. p. 595. [The most valuable are Chr. Cellarius, *Hist. gentis Samarit.* in his *Diss. Acad.* p. 109, &c. Joh. Morin, *Antiq. Eccles. orient.* Ja. Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. ii. lib. ii. c. 1—13. H. Reland, *de Samaritanis*, in his *Diss. Miscell.* pt. ii. (H. Prideaux, *Connections*),

and Baumgarten, *Geschichte der Religions-part.* p. 274, &c. *Schl.*]

³ See Ja. Gronovius, *Decreta Romana et Asiatica pro Judæis, ad cultum dicendum per Asia Minoris urbes secure observandum*, Lugd. Bat. 1712, 8vo. [For a candid and faithful account of the state of the Jews, both in Palestine and out of it, the English reader is referred to Lardner's *Credibility of the*

spectacle to mortals of a teacher that could not err, of one too, who, though their king, should appear for them in the court of heaven. In what year salvation thus shone upon the world, the most persevering efforts of very learned men have as yet been unable to ascertain. Nor will this surprise us, if we consider that the earliest Christians knew not the *day* of their Saviour's birth, and judged differently on the subject¹. But of what consequence is it, that we know not the year or day when this

Gospel history, pt. i. vol. i. ch. ii.—vi. Tr.]

¹ Most of the opinions of the learned, concerning the year of Christ's birth, are collected by J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliographia Antiquar.* cap. vii. § ix. p. 137. —[Respecting the year of Christ's birth, the inquisitive reader is remitted to the elaborate Chronologists, Scaliger, Petavius, Usher, &c., and to the more voluminous eccles. Historians, Natalis Alexander, Pagi, &c. But, not to leave the common reader wholly uninformed on the subject, a few general observations will here be made. The birth of Christ was first made an era, from which to reckon dates, by Dionysius Exiguus, about A.D. 532. He supposed Christ to have been born on the 25th December, in the year of Rome, 753, Lentulus and Piso consuls. And this computation has been followed, in practice, to this day; notwithstanding the learned are well agreed, that it must be incorrect. To ascertain the true time of Christ's birth, there are *two principal data*, afforded by the Evangelists. I. It is clear, from Matt. ii. 1, &c. that Christ was born *before* the death of Herod the Great, who died about Easter, in the year of Rome 749 or 750. (Lardner, *Credibility*, &c. pt. i. vol. ii. Appendix.) Now if Christ was born in the December next before Herod's death, it must have been in the year of Rome 748 or 749; and of course, four, if not five years anterior to the Dionysian or vulgar era. II. It is probable, from Lu. iii. 1, 2, 23, that Jesus was about thirty years of age, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar. Now the reign of Tiberius may be considered as commencing at the time he became sole emperor, in August of the year of Rome 767; or, (as there is some reason to suppose, that Augustus made him partner in the government *two years before* he died,) we may begin his reign in the year of Rome 765. The 15th year of Tiberius will, there-

fore, be either the year of Rome, 781, or 779. From which deduct 30, and we have the year of Rome 751 or 749, for the year of Christ's birth; the former *two*, and the latter *four years earlier* than the Dionysian computation.—Comparing these results with those obtained from the death of Herod, it is generally supposed the true era of Christ's birth was the year of Rome 749, or four years before the vulgar era. But the conclusion is not certain, because there is uncertainty in the data. (1) It is not certain, that we ought to reckon Tiberius' reign as beginning two years before the death of Augustus. (2) Luke says "*about thirty years of age*." This is indefinite, and may be understood of 29, 30, or 31 years. (3) It is not certain in which of the two years mentioned Herod died; nor *how long* before that event, the Saviour was born. Respecting the *month and day* of Christ's birth, we are left almost wholly to conjecture. The disagreement of the early fathers is evidence, that the day was not celebrated as a festival in the apostolic times. Tr.—The particulars of this disagreement may be seen in Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, vol. ii. p. 302. Lond. 1726. It is, undoubtedly, not possible to prove that the festival was observed under the Apostles, although many learned men have been of that opinion; but of its very high antiquity there is no question; and one reason of the uncertainty respecting it may have come from the varying usages of the East and the West. The former celebrated all in one day, viz., the sixth of January, Christ's incarnation, the star that shone over the place of his nativity, the appearance of the Holy Ghost at his baptism, and the manifestation of his divinity by the change of water into wine, at Cana of Galilee. The Latin Church celebrated the nativity on the 25th of December, and the Epiphany as a distinct festival. *Ed.]*

light first shone, since we fully know that it *has* appeared, and that nothing need prevent us from enjoying its brilliancy and warmth?

§ 2. An account of the birth, lineage, family, and parents of Christ, is left us by the four inspired writers who give the history of his life. But they say very little respecting his childhood and youth. While yet of tender age, he passed into Egypt with his parents, to escape Herod's cruelty². When twelve years of age, he disputed publicly in the temple, with the most learned Jewish doctors, upon religious subjects. Afterwards, till he was thirty years of age, he lived with his parents, as a good and obedient son³. Divine wisdom has not seen fit to give us more particulars; nor is it certain,—though many think it so,—that Christ worked at the trade of his foster-father Joseph, who was a carpenter. Yet anciently there were vain and crafty persons, who ventured to fill up this obscure part of our Saviour's life with extravagant and ridiculous fables⁴.

§ 3. In the thirtieth year of his age, he entered on the offices for which he came into the world. To render his ministry more useful to the Jews, John, the son of a Jewish priest, a man grave and venerable in his whole manner of life, was commissioned by God, to proclaim the advent of the Messiah promised to the fathers. He called himself the Messiah's *precursor*, and, warmed with holy zeal, gave his countrymen to understand that their vices must be put away and minds made pure, if they would become worthy of the benefits from the Son of God's advent, or rather from his actual presence. He likewise initiated into the Saviour's approaching kingdom, those who promised amendment of mind and life, by immersion in the river⁵. And from this John, even Jesus himself, before he entered upon the office of teaching, chose to receive a solemn lustration, lest, according to his own words, he should seem to have neglected any observance that became a Jew⁶.

² Matt. ii. 13.

³ Luko ii. 51, 52.

⁴ See a collection of these fables by J. A. Fabricius, *Coder Apocryphas N. Test.* tom. i. [The works here referred to, are the Gospel of the nativity of Mary: the Previous Gospel, ascribed to James the Just: the Gospel of the infancy of Christ, ascribed to Thomas: the

Gospel of the infancy, &c. translated from the Arabic; all of which are stuffed with marvellous tales of miracles and prodigies, fit only to amuse the ignorant and superstitious. *Tr.*]

⁵ Matt. iii. 2. John i. 22.

⁶ [See, concerning John the Baptist, Chr. Cellarius, two *Diss. de vita, carcere et supplicio Jo. Bapt.* in his *Diss.*

§ 4. It is not necessary to enter here into a particular detail of the life and actions of Jesus Christ. All Christians know, that for more than three years, amidst great sorrows, molestations, snares, and perils, he instructed the Jewish people in the counsels and purposes of the Most High; nothing having been omitted by him which might allure either the rude and ignorant people, or the wiser men; that he led a life so holy and spotless as to defy even every suspicion; finally, that by stupendous miracles, of a salutary and beneficial character, exactly suitable to his healing mission, he placed beyond all controversy the truth of that religion which was thus offered to mankind.

§ 5. As this religion was to be propagated throughout the world, it was necessary for him to select some persons for his constant companions and intimates; who should be able to state and testify to posterity, and to the remotest nations, with the greatest assurance and authority, the events of his life, his miracles, and his whole system of doctrine. Therefore, from the Jews about him, he chose twelve messengers, whom he distinguished from the rest by title of *Apostles*. They were plebeians, poor, and illiterate; for he would not employ the rich, the eloquent, and the learned; lest the success of their mission should be ascribed to human and natural causes⁷. These he once sent forth among the Jews, during his lifetime⁸; but afterwards, he retained them constantly near him; that they might witness all that he said or did⁹. But, that the people might not lack religious instruction, he commissioned seventy other disciples, to travel at large through Judea¹.

Acad. pt. i. p. 169, and pt. ii. p. 373. Tho. Ittig, *Historiæ eccles. imi sæculi selecta capita*, cap. 8, sect. 4, and Witsius, *Miscell. Sacra*, tom. ii. p. 464, &c. *Schl.*—Also G. B. Winer, *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, article *Johannes Tr.*]

⁷ 1 Cor. i. 21.

⁸ Matt. x. 7.

⁹ [Dr. Mosheim has a long note in the parallel passage of his *Comment. de Rebus Chr. ante C. M.* p. 49, the substance of which is this. The title *Apostles* was given to those principal men, whom the high priests retained as their private counsellors; and whom they occasionally sent as their legates to the foreign Jews; either to collect the yearly tax for the temple; or to execute other commissions. We have not, indeed, a direct testimony

at hand, proving that the title of *apostles* was given to such legates of the high priests in the days of Christ. Yet there is intimation of this in Gal. i. 1, and Jerome so understood the passage. See his *Comment.*, &c., Opp. tom. ix. p. 124. And that after the destruction of Jerusalem, the legates of the Jewish Patriarchs (who stood in the place of high priests) were called apostles, is fully proved. See Jerome, *ubi supra*, and Eusebius on *Isa.* ch. xviii. 2. See also Ja. Godefroi on *Cod. Theodos.* tom. vi. p. 251, ed. Ritter. Dion. Petavius, on *Epiphan. ad Hæres.* xxx. P. Wesseling, *de Archontibus Jud.* p. 91. Walch (of Götting.) *Hist. Patriarch. Jud.*; and Suicer, *The-saur. Eccles.* tom. i. p. 477. *Tr.*]

¹ Luke x. 1.

§ 6. The learned have inquired why the Saviour appointed just *twelve*, neither more nor less, to be apostles; and *seventy* to be his disciples; and various conjectures are offered on the subject.

But as it is manifest from the words of *Christ* himself², that the number of the apostles had reference to the number of the tribes of Israel, there can scarcely be a doubt that he wished to indicate to the Jews, that he was the supreme Lord and Pontiff of the whole Hebrew race, which was divided into twelve tribes. The seventy disciples were just equal in number to the senators, composing the Sanhedrim, or grand council of the nation: and this justifies the conjecture that *Christ* intended, by the choice of the *seventy*, to admonish the Jews that the authority of their Sanhedrim was now at an end, and that all power in relation to religious matters, was vested in him alone³.

§ 7. Jesus himself gave instruction to none but Jews; nor did he allow his disciples to travel among other nations, as teachers, while he continued on earth⁴. Yet the extraordinary deeds performed by him, leave no room to doubt that his fame, very early, extended to other nations. There are respectable writers, who state that *Abgarus*, king of Edessa, being dangerously sick, sent a letter to Christ, imploring his assistance; and that he not only wrote an answer to the king, but also sent him his picture⁵. It is, however, the prevailing opinion, that not only the letters of Christ and *Abgarus*, but likewise the whole story, are fabrications⁶. I would by no means venture to support the credit of

² Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30.

³ [There are two fictitious lists of the seventy disciples now extant; which are falsely ascribed to Hippolytus, and to Dositheus. They may be seen in various works; e. g. J. A. Fabricius, *Lux Ecclæ*, &c. p. 115—118, and annexed to the books *de Vita et Morte Mosi*, ed. Fabricius; and in T. Ittig, *Hist. Eccles. imi sæcul.* p. 472. That no sort of credit is due to them, is shown by Ittig, *ubi supra*; by D. Blondell, *de Episcopis et Presbyt.* p. 93, and by others. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* i. 12, expressly declares, that no catalogue of the seventy disciples was to be found anywhere, in his day. The two lists nearly agree; and are evidently made up by collecting together, without the least judgment, nearly all the names of Christians mentioned in the N. Testament, and parti-

cularly in the salutations of Paul. *Tr.*]

⁴ Matt. x. 5, 6; xv. 24.

⁵ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* i. i. c. 18. [Here is the earliest notice of these Letters. For the earliest history of the picture, see Evagrius, *Hist. Eccles.* i. iv. c. 27. See the Letters themselves, with notes in] J. A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* tom. i. p. 317.

⁶ See Ja. Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. i. c. 18, p. 500. Theoph. Sigf. Bayer, *Historia Edessæna et Osroënæ*, l. iii. p. 104. J. S. Asseman, *Biblioth. orient. Clem. Vat.* tom. i. p. 554. [“As to the picture, which is still preserved, and shown at Rome, Is. Beausobre has fully exposed the fable, in his *Dis. des Images de main divine*; in the *Biblioth. Germanique*, tom. xviii. p. 10, &c.”] Mosheim *de Rebus Chr.* §c. p. 73.

the letters; but I see no very weighty reason why the thing itself may not be considered as true upon the whole.

§ 8. There was, indeed, no small number of the Jews, who, moved by so many signs of divine authority in *Christ*, looked up to him as the Son of God: but the leading men, especially the Pharisees and chief priests, whose crimes and vices he freely reproved, plotted against his life; being fearful of losing their honours and privileges, if *Christ* should continue publicly to teach. Long were the machinations of this wicked crew vain and fruitless. But *Judas*, an ungrateful disciple, disclosing the place of his master's nocturnal retirement, he was seized by soldiers, at the command of the Sanhedrim, and orders were given for trying him capitally.

§ 9. He was first arraigned before the Jewish high priest and senate, upon a charge of doing violence to the majesty and law of God. Dragged thence to the procurator, he was there accused of sedition, and of treason against Caesar. Neither of these accusations could have satisfied fair and upright judges. But the clamours of the people, which were instigated by the irreligious priests, compelled *Pilate*, though reluctantly, to pass sentence of death upon him. Having come into our world to make expiation for the sins of men, and knowing that all the objects of his abode among them were accomplished, he voluntarily submitted to be nailed to a cross, on which was yielded up his spotless soul to God.

§ 10. On the third day after his burial, he re-assumed the life, which he had voluntarily laid down; and coming forth in human shape, he made it plain that God's justice could no longer claim a debt from men⁷. He now continued forty days with his disciples, employing the time very much in giving them instruction. To his enemies he would not visibly appear; as well for other reasons, as because he knew, that men, so unprincipled as to accuse him long ago of sorcery, would resolutely say, that some spectre had arisen, which bore his form, and came from an evil spirit's power. At length, while the disciples watched his movements he went from their presence up into heaven, having first entrusted them with an embassy to the human race.

⁷ ["And rising from the dead, declared to the universe, by that triumphant act, that the divine justice was satisfied." Maclaine. *Ed.*]

CHAPTER IV.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Effusion of the II. Spirit on the apostles.—§ 2. They preach to Jews and Samaritans.—§ 3. Election of a new Apostle.—§ 4. Paul's conversion.—§ 5. Attention to the poor, and a community of goods, in the church.—§ 6. Many churches planted by the apostles.—§ 7. Respect for Christ among the pagans.—§ 8. Causes of the rapid progress of Christianity.—§ 9. Extraordinary gifts of the early Christians.—§ 10. Fictitious causes assigned for the progress of Christianity.

§ 1. When *Jesus* was seated at the right hand of the eternal Father, he gave the first proof of his majesty and power on the fiftieth day¹ after his death, by the effusion of the Holy Spirit, upon his disciples and friends on earth². On receiving this celestial gift and teacher, they were freed from all their former ignorance and blindness of mind, and endued with astonishing alacrity and power to fulfil the duties of their office. With these mental endowments, was joined the knowledge of various foreign languages; which was indispensable to them, in giving instruction to different nations; and also a firm reliance on the promise of *Christ*, that God would aid them as often as should be necessary, by miracles³.

§ 2. Relying on these heavenly aids, they first, as our Saviour had enjoined, sought converts among the Jews⁴. Nor was this labour without effect, for many thousands of them soon became Christians⁵. Next going to the Samaritans, which also their commission required⁶, they gathered among them also a Christian church⁷. Lastly, after spending many years at Jerusalem,

¹ [From the terms here used by Dr. Mosheim, it would seem that he supposed the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, took place on the Jewish sabbath, or *Saturday*; and not on *Sunday*, as many have supposed. *Tr.*]

² Acts ii. 1.

³ [In his *Comment. de Rebus Christ. ante C. M.* p. 76, Dr. Mosheim states, that he does not account the power of working miracles among the supernatural

gifts; because such power neither was, nor could be, conferred on men, Omnipotence alone being able to work miracles; so that, *faith* to pray for them, and to expect them, at the hands of God, was all that the II. Ghost actually imparted to the apostles. *Tr.*]

⁴ Luke xxiv. 47; Acts i. 8; xiii. 46.

⁵ Acts ii. 41; iv. 4.

⁶ Acts i. 8.

⁷ Acts viii. 14.

and settling and confirming the churches of Christ in Palestine and the neighbouring regions, they went away to various nations of the globe, their labours meeting every where with very great success⁸.

§ 3. The first care of the apostles after our Saviour's ascension, was to make up their number to twelve, according to Christ's own precedent, by electing a holier person to the place of Judas, who had laid violent hands on himself. Therefore, the little company of *Christ's* servants at Jerusalem being assembled, two men highly conspicuous for piety and faith in *Christ*, *Barabas* and *Matthias*, were proposed, as the most worthy of that office. One of these, *Matthias*, either by lot, which is the general opinion, or by a majority of the suffrages of the persons present, was constituted the twelfth apostle⁹.

§ 4. As all these twelve ambassadors of *Christ* were plain, unlettered men, while the Christian community, though still in its infancy, needed an individual who could attack and overcome both Jewish doctors and Gentile philosophers with weapons of their own; *Jesus Christ* himself soon after the appointment of *Matthias*, by a voice from heaven, created a thirteenth apostle. This was *Saul*, who subsequently chose the name of *Paul*, and who had been a most virulent enemy of the Christians, but in whom a first-rate skill in Jewish learning was combined with a knowledge of the Grecian¹. To this truly admirable man, whether we consider his courage, his force of mind, or his patience and fortitude under difficulties, how much the Christian world is indebted, every body knows from the *Acts of the Apostles*, and his own *Epistles*.

§ 5. The first of all the Christian churches founded by the apostles, was that of Jerusalem: after the form and model of which, all the others of that age were constituted. That church,

⁸ [It appears from the book of *Acts*, that the apostles, or at least most of them, remained in and near Jerusalem, for several years after the ascension; but how long they continued together is uncertain. There was anciently a tradition, which Eusebius states, (*Hist. Eccles.* v. 18,) on the authority of Apollonius, a writer of the second century, as does Clemens Alex. (*Strom.* vi. c. 5.) from a spurious work, *Prædicatio Petri*, —that the Saviour enjoined upon his apostles not to leave Jerusalem, till twelve years after his ascension. About

so long they probably continued there: and their being divinely guided, in most of their movements, might give rise to the tradition. *Tr.*]

⁹ Acts i. 15.

[Dr. Mosheim has a long note in the parallel place in his *Comment. de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 78—80, in which he aims to prove, that ἐδωκαν κλήρους αὐτῶν, in Acts i. 26, signifies they gave their votes; and not, as it is commonly understood, they cast their lots. But his interpretation is very generally rejected. *Tr.*]

¹ Acts ix. 1.

however, was governed immediately by the apostles; to whom were subject both the *presbyters*, and those who took care of the poor, or *deacons*. Though the people had not withdrawn themselves from the Jewish worship, yet they held their own separate meetings; in which they received instruction from the apostles and presbyters; poured forth united prayers; kept up, in the sacred supper, a remembrance of Jesus Christ, of his death, and of the salvation gotten by him; lastly, manifested their mutual love, partly by liberality to the poor, partly by those temperate repasts, which from their design were called *love-feasts*². Among the virtues, by which this first family of our Saviour's was distinguished, that which soonest struck attention was care for the needy and distressed. For the richer members liberally supplied what the necessities of their brethren required, and moreover with such a ready mind, that Luke writes of the goods of all as common to all³. These words, though commonly understood as implying community of *possessions*, have been so taken without sufficient enquiry, as is manifest both from St. Peter's words⁴, and other things. They mean only community of use⁵.

§ 6. The ambassadors of Christ, leaving Jerusalem, travelled over a great part of the world; and in a short time collected numerous religious societies in various countries. Of churches founded by them, not a small number is mentioned in the sacred books, especially in the *Acts* of the Apostles⁶. Besides these,

² Acts ii. 42. [Dr. Mosheim understood this text as descriptive of the several parts of the *ordinary public worship* of these primitive Christians, rather than of their *Christian character and conduct* in general. See his *Comment. de Rebus Christianorum ante C. Mag.* p. 113—116. If Mosheim's interpretation of that text is erroneous, as most interpreters think it is, this account of the mode of worship in the apostolic church, rests on a slender basis. *Tr.*] Mosheim's notion of primitive worship, founded upon this text, is, that it consisted of preaching, a collection for the poor, analogous to the offertory collections of later times, the administration of the eucharist, and prayer. The principal difficulty in fixing this construction upon the words of St. Luke here, lies upon the second member in the series. The original word is *Koinwvia*, which our translators have rendered *fellowship*, and

which Grotius takes to mean *religious conference*, but which is used, both in the New Testament and elsewhere, for an eleemosynary contribution. See Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 13; Heb. xiii. 16; and *Suicer in voc. Koinwvia. Ed.*]

³ Acts ii. 44; iv. 32.

⁴ Acts v. 4.

⁵ ["It is an ancient opinion, though not older than the fourth century, that in the church of Jerusalem there was such a *community of goods*, as existed among the ancient Essenes and now among monks. But this opinion is destitute of any solid foundation; resting solely on the declaration of Luke, that they had all things common. See my *Diss. de vera natura communionis bonorum in ecclesia Hierosolym.* which is the first in the second volume of my *Dissert. ad historiam eccl. pertinentes.*" Mosheim, *de Rebb. Christ.* &c. p. 118.]

⁶ The names of these churches are

there can be no doubt, they collected many others; both by their own efforts, and by the efforts of their followers. But how far they travelled, what nations they visited, or when and where they died, is exceedingly dubious and uncertain⁷. The stories often told respecting their travels among the Gauls, the Britons, the Spaniards, the Germans, the Americans, the Chinese, the Indians, and the Russians, are too recent and fantastic to be received by an inquisitive lover of the truth⁸. A great

collected by P. J. Hartmann, *de Rebus gestis Christianor. sub Apostolis*, cap. vii. p. 107; and by J. A. Fabricius, *Lucæ Evangelii toti orbi exorients*, cap. v. p. 83, &c.

⁷ [It is a very ancient and current report, confirmed by many witnesses, that all the apostles suffered public martyrdom, with the exception of St. John, who died a natural death at Ephesus. And this opinion is so firmly believed by many who would not be thought credulous, that to call it in question, is to run some hazard of being charged with slandering these holy men. Such as please, may believe the account; but let them not be offended, if I declare the martyrdom of most of the apostles to be less certain than they suppose. That Peter, Paul, and James died violent deaths, I believe, on the testimony of the numerous ancient authors; but that the other apostles did so, I cannot feel so certain. As my first ground of doubt, a very ancient writer of the second century, Heracleon, a Valentinian indeed, but no contemptible man, cited by Clemens Alex. *Strom.* l. iv. c. 9, denies that Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, and others, confessed Christ before magistrates, and were put to death for so doing. He is urging, that the public confession of himself required by the Saviour, Matt. x. 32, may be made by a holy and Christian life, as well as by a public avowal before a persecuting magistrate; and he states as proof, *Ὅ γὰρ πάντες οἱ σωζόμενοι ὡμολόγησαν τὴν διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ὡμολογίαν, καὶ ἐξῆλθον. Ἐξ ὧν Ματθαῖος, Φίλιππος, Θωμᾶς, Λεβὶς, καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί, for not all that were saved, made that confession in words (before magistrates), and so did. Of this number was Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, and many others. Clement, though he disapproves several things in the passage he quotes, leaves this statement to stand as it is; which is proof that he had nothing to allege against it.*

—Philip is expressly declared not to have suffered martyrdom, but to have died and been buried at Hierapolis; so says Polycrates, in his Epistle to Victor, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 24. Baronius, indeed, (*Annals*, A.D. 35, § 141,) and after him many others, maintain, that this was not *Philip the apostle*, but Philip, one of the seven deacons of Jerusalem. But Polycrates says expressly, that he was *one of the twelve apostles*.—A still stronger argument is, that all the writers of the three first centuries, and among them such as contended for the high dignity of the martyrs, in opposition to the Valentinians, viz. Tertullian, Clemens Alex., and Origen, never mention but *three* of the apostles as being martyrs; namely, Peter, Paul, and James the elder. See Tertullian, *Scorpice*, cap. xv.—I am therefore led to believe, that the common reports respecting the sufferings of Christ's ambassadors were fabricated, after the days of Constantine. And two causes might lead to such reports. (1.) The extravagant estimation in which martyrdom was held, made it seem necessary to rank the apostles among the martyrs.—(2.) The ambiguity of the word *μάρτυρ*, *martyr*, which properly signifies a *witness*, in which sense Christ himself called his apostles *μάρτυρες*, (Acts i. 8, see also Acts ii. 32,) might lead the more ignorant to believe, and to amplify these fables. Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. ante C. M.* p. 81—84, abridged considerably. *Tr.*]

⁸ [“There is not *one* of the European nations that does not glory, in either an apostle, or some one of the seventy disciples, or at least in some early saint commissioned by an apostle, as having come among them and collected a Christian church. The *Spaniards* say, that the apostles Paul and James the elder, with many of the seventy disciples, and other assistants of the apostles, introduced the light of the gospel into *their* country. And a Spaniard

part of these fables came forward after the age of *Charlemagne*; when most of the Christian churches contended as vehemently,

would bring himself into trouble if he should confront this opinion. The *French* contend that *Crescens*, a disciple and companion of Paul, Dionysius the Athenian Arcopagite, Lazarus, Mary Magdalene, &c. first brought their countrymen to profess Christ. Among the *Italians* there is scarcely a city which does not profess to have received the gospel, and its first minister from Paul or Peter. See P. Giannone, *Histoire civile du royaume de Naples*, tom. i. p. 74, 75. And, at this day, a man could not escape the charge of heresy, who should raise a question on this subject. See J. Lamy, *Delicæ eruditiorum*, tom. viii. Pref. and tom. xi. Preface. The *Germans* assert that Maternus, Valerianus, and many others were sent among them by the apostles; and that these legates of St. Peter, and of the other apostles, baptized respectable numbers of persons. The *British* think that St. Paul, (as they infer from Clemens Rom. first Epistle to the Corinthians,) Simon Zelotes, Aristobulus, and especially Joseph of Arimathea, were the founders of their church. The *Russians*, *Poles*, and *Prussians*, honour St. Andrew as the founder of their churches. All this, and much more, passed for sober truth, so long as sacred and human learning lay buried in shades and darkness. But at this day, the most learned and wise admit, that most of these stories were fabricated after the age of *Charlemagne*, by men unlearned, or crafty and eager to secure distinction to their churches. See Aug. Calmet's *Histoire de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. xxvi. Le Beuf, *Diss. sur l'histoire de France*, tom. i. p. 192, &c. Jo. Launoi, *Diss. qua locus Salpiti Scveri de primis Galliarum martyribus, defenditur*, Opp. tom. ii. pt. i. p. 184.—I commend these writers; yet cannot agree with them in dating the commencement of this foolish zeal for the antiquity of their churches, after the days of *Charlemagne*. It began much earlier. See Gregory Turon. *de Gloria martyrum*, cap. xii. p. 735." Mosheim, *de Reb. Christ.* §c. p. 84—86. It must not be inferred from what Dr. Mosheim says of the foolish pretensions of the modern European nations to a high Christian antiquity, that we are to reject all that the ancient fathers relate, concerning the labours of the apostles after Christ's ascension.

Dr. Mosheim was too judicious to do this. He says, *ubi supra*, p. 80, 81: "As to what we are told respecting the transactions of the apostles, their travels, miracles, and deaths, if we except what is gathered from the New Test. and a few other ancient monuments, a large part is dubious and uncertain. Some things, however, have more credibility and verisimilitude than others. I would not reject all that is clearly attested by Origen, Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, Paulinus, Jerome, Socrates, and some more ancient writers quoted by Eusebius; but what is attested only by authors subsequent to these, or unknown, I would not readily believe, unless facts offer themselves to corroborate the testimony."—Following these judicious rules of Mosheim, we may believe that Peter, after preaching long in Judea, and other parts of Syria, probably visited Babylon, Asia Minor, and finally Rome, where he was crucified.—Paul's history is given in the Acts to about a.d. 64. He was probably released from captivity, visited Judea, Asia Minor, and Greece, and returning to Rome, was there beheaded about a.d. 67 or 68. John remained many years in Judea, and afterwards removed to Ephesus, where he lived to a very advanced age, dying about a.d. 100. He was banished to Patmos about a.d. 95, and was greatly revered. James the elder (brother of John,) was put to death by Herod Agrippa about a.d. 44. (Acts xii. 1.) James the younger, the son of Alphaeus, spent his life in Judea, long presided over the church of Jerusalem, and there suffered martyrdom, a little before the destruction of Jerusalem. Andrew probably laboured on the shores of the Black Sea, near the modern Constantinople, and perhaps in Greece. Philip, either the apostle or the evangelist, is reported to have ended his days at Hierapolis, in Phrygia. Thomas seems to have travelled eastward, to Parthia, Media, Persia, and India. Bartholomew took, perhaps, a more southern course, and preached in Arabia. Matthew is also reported to have travelled east, in the modern Persia. Of Simon the Canaanite, nothing to be relied on can be said. Thaddæus, Lebbeus, or Jude the brother of James, the author of an epistle, is reported to

about the antiquity of their respective origins, as ever did in former days the Arcadians, Egyptians, Greeks, and other nations.

§ 7. Many who were unwilling to adopt entirely the religion of Christ, were induced, nevertheless, by the fame of his deeds, and the sublime purity of his doctrines, to rank him among men of the highest excellence, and even among the gods; as numerous documents evince. With great veneration, many kept figures of Christ and of his apostles in their houses⁹. The emperor Tiberius has the credit of desiring to enrol Christ among the gods of Rome, but to have been unable, because he was resisted by the senate¹. Although many, at the present day, think this improbable, there are, nevertheless, weighty reasons which lead no common men to a different opinion².

have preached at Edessa, in the north of Syria. Of the companions of the apostles, Timothy, after accompanying Paul many years, is said to have been stationed at Ephesus, where he suffered martyrdom under Domitian or Nerva. Titus, another companion of Paul, is reported to have been stationed in Crete, where he died. Mark, or John surnamed Mark, attended Paul, and afterwards Peter, and probably preached the gospel in Egypt. Of Luke, little can be said, except that he accompanied Paul, and wrote his history, viz. the book of Acts, and a Gospel. Of Barnabas, nothing can be said worth relating, except what is learned from the New Testament. See J. A. Fabricius, *Lib. Eecangelii*, &c. ch. v. p. 95—115.—From this account, imperfect as it is, we may conclude that the apostles and their companions scarcely extended their labours beyond the boundaries of the present Turkish empire. *Tr.*

[The late Dr. Burton thought St. Paul's death referrible to some period between the years 64 and 66, inclusively, probably the year 66, the thirteenth of Nero. From his conversion to his death, thirty-five years seem to have elapsed. *An Attempt to ascertain the Chronology of the Acts of the Apostles and of St. Paul's Epistles*, Oxford, 1830, p. 104. *Ed.*]

⁹ Eusebius, *Historia Eecles.* l. vii. c. 18. Irenæus, *Hæres.* lib. i. c. 25, p. 105, edit. Massuet.

¹ "Tiberius ergo, ejus tempore nomen christianum in seculum introivit, annunciata sibi ex Syria Palestina, quæ

illie veritatem illius divinitatis revelaverant, detulit ad senatum cum prerogativa suffragii sui. Senatus, quia non ipse probaverat, respuit. Caesar in sententia mansit, comminatus periculum accusatoribus christianorum." (Tertull. *Apol.* c. 5.) In this passage Pearson would read, *quia non in se probaverat*, for *quia non ipse probaverat*, and interpret the sentence thus: *the senate rejected the proposal, because Tiberius had not approved a similar proposal in his own case—had himself refused to be deified.* Lardner contends that this must be the meaning, even if *ipse* is retained. But a sentence which precedes, *Vetus erat decretum, ne qui Deus ab imperatore consecraretur, nisi a senatu probatus*, shows that *ipse* refers to *senatus*: *the senate refused, because it had not itself approved the proposal*; and so the passage was translated in the Greek version used by Eusebius. In a subsequent passage, Tertullian states, that the account of those supernatural events which proved the divinity of Christ, was sent to Tiberius by Pilate, who was in his conscience a Christian, and adds an expression which implies that worldly considerations alone prevented Tiberius from believing in Christ." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 110. *Ed.*

² ["Of the favourable disposition of the Roman emperors towards Christianity, there is a noticeable testimony in the Apology of Melito Sardicensis, addressed to Marcus Antoninus, which is preserved by Eusebius, *Hist. Eec.* iv. 26. Melito here informs the emperor that his predecessors not only tolerated

§ 8. The causes must have been divine, which enabled men, — destitute of all human aid, poor, friendless, neither eloquent nor learned, fishermen, publicans, and moreover Jews, that is, persons odious to all other nations, — in so short a time, to persuade a great part of mankind to abandon the religions of their fathers, and to embrace a new religion, which is opposed to the natural dispositions of men. Their very words in fact acted on the mind with a force that could scarcely be believed, and that could come only from above. There were added prodigies and miracles, a prophetic declaration of things to come, the discovery of hidden counsels, loftiness of mind in the greatest emergencies, contempt for all the objects of ordinary ambition, a patient, cheerful endurance of sufferings worse than death, as well as of death itself, and finally, lives without a single spot. Among the things that men believe most firmly, no one is more unquestionable than that Jesus Christ's ambassadors had all these qualifications, and in abundance. Imagine these holy men without such endowments, and no probable reason can be given for the rapid propagation of Christianity by a band so small and feeble.

Christianity among the other religions, but also honoured it: *ἦν καὶ οἱ πρόγονοι σοῦ πρὸς ταῖς ἄλλαις θρησκείαις ἐτίμησαν*, which sect your progenitors treated with equal respect as the other religions. He adds, that Nero and Domitian were the only emperors who allowed the counsels of certain adversaries to influence them to make Christianity a criminal thing. If what Melito here says of Nero be true, namely, that he was influenced by the counsels of malevolent persons, to persecute the Christians, then there may be some foundation for what John of Antioch says, in *Excerptis Valesianis*, p. 808, &c. that Nero was favourable to the Christians, and to Christ, in the beginning of his reign. — Tertullian, *Apologet.* c. v. p. 57, ed. Havercamp. speaks of Tiberius's desire to have Christ enrolled among the gods, as of a thing universally known. Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. 2,) Orosius, (*Chron. Pascad.* vii. 4,) and others, afterwards repeat the story, relying chiefly on the authority of Tertullian. See Fr. Baldwin, *Comment. ad Edicta Veterum Principum Romanorum de Christianis*, p. 22, 23, and J. A. Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, §c. p. 221. But

very learned men, in this age, have deemed this wholly incredible, and not at all compatible with the character of Tiberius, and with the state of the empire at that time. In what manner men, equally learned and ingenious, have repelled their arguments, may be seen in the Essay of Theod. Haaseus, *de decreto Tiberii, quo Christum referre voluit in numerum deorum*, Erfurt. 1715, 4to, and in the French letter of J. C. Iselius, on this subject, in the *Bibliothèque Germanique*, tom. xxxii. p. 147; and tom. xxxiii. p. 12." — Mosheim, *de Rebb. Christ.* §c. p. 91, &c. — See also Altmann, *Disquisitio historico-critica de Epistola Pilati ad Tiberium*, §c. Bern, 1755, 8vo. In this Essay, Professor Altmann maintains, (1) That Pilate was actually informed of the resurrection by the guard. (2) That he did really send to Tiberius an account of the death and resurrection of Jesus, though not such an account as the one now extant. (3) That Tiberius actually proposed in the senate that Jesus should be honoured as a god. This subject is also examined by Dr. Lardner, *Collection of Jewish and Heathen testimonies*, vol. iii. p. 599, &c. ed. Lond. 1815. 4to. Tr.]

§ 9. To all this must be added the ability which these ambassadors of God possessed, of transferring the power of working miracles to their disciples. Many had, accordingly, no sooner been baptized, according to Christ's injunction, and consecrated to God by the imposition of hands and prayer, than they expressed at once their thoughts in foreign languages which they had never learned, foretold future events, healed the sick by pronouncing the name of Jesus, called even the dead back to life, and effected other things above human power³. What, and how great must have individuals appeared, who could invest others with such faculties as these!

§ 10. Such as tax imagination for other causes of this sudden revolution among men, tell us dreams which will please none who know the world. Some conjecture that the kindness of Christians to the poor, induced a multitude of idle and vicious persons to embrace their faith. But it is forgotten here, that Christianity could not be professed without incurring an immediate risk of life; as also, that Christians did not suffer in their body the vicious, useless, and idle⁴. Equally groundless is the representation of others, that the profligate and flagitious lives of the pagan priests caused many to turn Christians. The profligacy of their priests might, indeed, breed contempt of the ancient religions, but it would not infuse the love of a faith which put life, credit, and property to the hazard. The man must be beside himself who could reason thus: "The priests of the religion which I learnt from tender years lead wicked lives: I shall, therefore, go over to a body that people despise and the law condemns, although neither life nor fortune will any more be safe⁵."

³ See, among others, Tob. Pfanner, *de Charismatibus, sive donis miraculosis antiquæ ecclesiæ*, Francof. 1683. 12mo.

⁴ 2 Thess. iii. 6—12.

⁵ ["Others have supposed, that the virtues of the apostles and their early followers,—their sobriety, their contempt of wealth, their fortitude, their patience, &c.—induced multitudes to put themselves under their religious guidance. Integrity and virtue certainly have influence on the mind of the beholder; nor would I deny, that the holy lives of the apostles produced some effect. But we know, if we are acquainted with ourselves and with human nature, that purity of morals, and integrity of life,

though they create respect and reverence, rarely produce imitation, and never, if manifest disgrace and danger will follow that imitation. We know that virtue, and even the most perfect virtue, awakens entire disgust, when it requires men to forsake the institutions and sentiments of their ancestors, and to abandon their chosen enjoyments. This is confirmed by the example of those very apostles who are said to have converted the world by the purity of their characters; nay, by the example of the Lord of those apostles, who was the most perfect pattern of virtue. I can believe that the blameless lives of the apostles induced individuals, among

CHAPTER V.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

- § 1. Persecutions of the Christians by Jews in Palestine.—§ 2. By Jews 'out of Palestine.—§ 3. Divine judgments on the Jews.—§ 4. Ten persecutions by the pagans.—§ 5. Laws against the Christians.—§ 6. Causes of hostility to them. Charged with hatred to mankind.—§ 7. Other causes of persecution.—§ 8. Slanders against Christians.—§ 9. Modes of trial and punishment.—§ 10. The martyrs and confessors.—§ 11. Number of them.—§ 12. Acts of the martyrs.—§ 13. Persecution by Nero.—§ 14. Its extent.—§ 15. Persecution under Domitian.

§ 1. ALTHOUGH those whom *Christ* had left as witnesses of his proceedings among men, were most conspicuous for holiness of

all nations, not to lay violent hands on them, or to show them any abuse; but to believe that they, merely by their strict morals, and their disregard for the common objects of human attachment, induced many thousands to recognize as the Saviour of the world, a person whom the Jews had caused to be crucified; to follow their own example, and to suffer death, rather than renounce these principles; this, I say, no one can persuade me to believe. And, not to protract these remarks, whence, and by what means, did the apostles themselves acquire that admirable virtue and sanctity, which alone was able to produce in others an invincible determination to fly to Christ, and to cleave to him as the only anchor of their salvation?"—"Others, following the example of Celsus, Julian, Porphyry, and other ancient enemies of Christianity, bid us consider, that the churches gathered by the apostles, were composed of plebeian characters, servants, labourers in the fields and workshops, and women; that is, of persons deficient in intelligence, rank, and wealth, who might easily be persuaded to believe almost any thing by persons of but moderate talents. But this, which is here so confidently asserted, in the first place, was not altogether true. For the Scriptures inform us, that, among those converted to Christianity by the apostles, many were af-

fluent, well informed, and of respectable rank. That there were persons of wealth, see 1 Tim. ii. 9, and 1 Peter iii. 3. That there were men of learning and knowledge of philosophy, see 1 Tim. vi. 20. Col. iii. 8. And that there were *some*, though *not many*, noble, see 1 Cor. i. 26. The names of illustrious persons who embraced Christ in the earliest ages of the church, are collected by D. Blondell, *de Episcopis et presbyteris*, p. 235, and by J. H. Wetstein, *Præfatio ad Origenis Dial. contra Marcion*. p. 13.—Secondly, those who are not ignorant of the world, know that persons in the lower walks of life, not only value themselves, their lives, and their enjoyments, as much as others do, but they much more ardently embrace, and cling to the customs, opinions, and religion of their ancestors, than men of genius and influence, the opulent and persons of rank.—Ignorance and timidity produce and nourish superstition. Hence the more ignorant and timid a person is, a stronger hold has superstition of his mind. So that it is an easier thing to eradicate superstition from the minds of ten men, than of one woman, from a hundred well-informed and ingenious minds, than from ten ignorant, stupid ones. Villainy no where reigns more than in servants and persons of abject condition. It would be easier, therefore, to purge from iniquity a multitude of the ingenious and well born,

doctrines and precepts, equally so too for innocence of life, yet the leading men and priests of the Jewish nation, not only poured upon them and their disciples the heaviest injuries and insults, but also inflicted capital punishment upon as many of them as they could. This appears from the martyrdom of *Stephen*, of *James* the son of Zebedee, and of *James the Just*, bishop of the church of Jerusalem¹. The true cause of this hostility, no one doubts to have been an angry feeling in the priests and doctors, who feared the ruin of their interests, if Christianity maintained its ground.

§ 2. Those Jews who lived out of Palestine, in the Roman provinces, had no greater humanity for the innocent disciples of *Christ*. It appears from the Acts of the Apostles, and from other credible records, that they spared no pains to instigate the magistrates and the populace to destroy the Christians. To this madness they were excited by the high priest and the elders of the Jews, living in Palestine; who, as we are informed, sent messengers to the foreign Jews, exhorting them not only to shun the Christians, but also to persecute them most acrimoniously². They sought a seemly cloak for this wicked system, by denouncing the Christians, as people hostile to the majesty of Rome, a malefactor, most justly slain by *Pilate*, being called by them their king. Such was the transmission of this madness from father to son, through successive generations, that the Christians had henceforth no enemies more bitter than the Jews³.

§ 3. But God himself exacted from this perfidious nation the severest punishments for so many crimes committed against Jesus and his friends. For he suffered Jerusalem, the capital of Palestine, together with the temple, to be rased to their foundations, by the Roman emperor *Vespasian* and his son *Titus*, about forty years after *Christ's* ascension; an innumerable multitude of the people being miserably butchered, and most of the

than even a small number of slaves. Hence, those who make the churches, gathered by the apostles of Christ, to have been composed of persons of no respectability or rank, of slaves, women, and the illiterate, in my judgment, increase, rather than diminish the glory achieved by those inspired men.²⁷ Moshcim, *de Rebb. Christ.* p. 90—92.]

¹ Acts vii. 55; xii. 1, 2. Joseph.

Antiq. Jud. l. xx. c. 8. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* l. ii. c. 23.

² See Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryphone*, p. 51—53, 109, 138, 318, ed. Jebb.

³ [Passages from early Christian writers, who complain of the Jewish persecutions, are collected by J. A. Fabricius, *Luc. Beang. toti orbi exorients*, ch. vi. § 1, p. 121. See also the Epist.

survivors being consigned to the hardships of slavery. The whole series of transactions, than which perhaps one more sad never happened, *Josephus*⁴, himself a Jew, has copiously and lucidly detailed. From this time, the Jews have encountered every where a great increase of popular malevolence and envy.

§ 4. The Gentiles, who were polytheists, brought upon the Christian church still greater calamities than the Jews, whose anger wanted power. The persecutions of the Christians by the Romans have, for many ages, been accounted *ten* in number⁵. But the ancient history of the church does not support precisely this number: for if we reckon only the general and more severe persecutions, they were fewer than ten; but if we include the provincial and more limited persecutions, the number will be much greater than ten. Some Christians of the fifth century were led into a belief, by certain passages of scripture, especially by one in the Apocalypse⁶, that the Christian body was fated to undergo *ten* calamities of the heavier kind; to which opinion they then accommodated history, though against her will, not, however, all in the same way⁷.

§ 5. Nero first enacted laws for the extermination of Christians. *Domitian* then did the same: afterwards *Marcus Antoninus* the philosopher, subsequently *Severus*, and other emperors, who were hostile to the Christians. Yet these decrees were not all equally severe, nor all founded on the same causes. A celebrated lawyer, of the name of *Domitius*, anciently collected all the imperial laws against the Christians, in his treatise *de Officio Præconsulis*⁸; which, if it were now extant, would

of the church of Smyrna, *de Martyrio Polycarpi*, § xii. xiii. *Schl.*]

⁴ In his History of the Jewish War. [See also Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. i. cap. 17. *Schl.*]

⁵ The writers on these persecutions are enumerated by J. A. Fabricius, *Lux Evang. toti orbi ætæternis*, cap. vii. p. 133, &c.

⁶ Ch. xvii. 12—14.

⁷ See Sulpitius Severus, *Historia Sacra*, lib. ii. c. 33, p. 387, ed. Horn. Augustinus, *de Civit. Dei*, l. xviii. c. 52. [In the fourth century, the number of the persecutions had not been defined. Lactantius, *de Mortibus Persecutorum*, reckons up only six. Eusebius, *Hist. Ecclæs.*, does not state their number; yet

we might make out *nine* from this writer. This is the number given by Sulpitius Severus, in the fifth century.. But in his times originated the opinion of just *ten* persecutions; and Sulpitius, to make out that number, includes the persecution of Antichrist in the end of the world. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. ante Const. May.* p. 98, &c. *Schl.*] Dr. Hey considers that eleven persecutions may be made out from Eusebius. *Lectures in Divinity*. Camb. 1841, i. 201. *Ed.*]

⁸ See Lactantius, *Instit. Divinar.* lib. v. c. 11. What remain of these laws, are illustrated by Fran. Baldwin, *Comment. ad edicta veter. princip. Romanor. de Christianis*; republished by N. H.

doubtless throw much light on the history of the church under the pagan emperors. Now very much is left wholly to conjecture.

§ 6. As the Romans did not trouble people on account of religion, and allowed even the Jews to live according to their own laws, it is not unreasonably asked, what could have caused all their severity to the Christians, whose religion, most holy in itself, was conducive to the people's welfare, both publicly and privately? The *first* cause of this cruelty, I conceive to be, because the Christians contemned and abhorred the public religion of the state, which was most closely connected and bound up with the forms of Roman polity. For though the Romans tolerated all religions from which the commonwealth had nothing to fear, yet they would not suffer the sacred rites of their ancestors, as established by the laws, to be derided, and the people withdrawn from them. Both these things, however, the Christians dared to do. Nor did they assail only the Roman religion, but likewise that professed by every other nation. Hence the Romans concluded, that the Christian sect, besides its extreme arrogance, had an unfriendliness to the public peace and tranquillity, which threatened civil wars. This, if I do not mistake, is that *hatred of the human race*, with which Tacitus taxes the Christians; nor do I think that any other reason induced him to call the Christian religion a *pestilent superstition*, or Suetonius to brand it as *malignant*⁹.

§ 7. Another cause, of very great weight, was the striking dissimilarity of Christian worship to that of all other religions. Among Christians were no victims, no temples, no statues, no oracles, no orders of priests¹. These things a religious body

Gundling, with Baldwin's *Constantinus Magnus*, Halle, 1727, 8vo.

⁹ [Tacitus says that the Christians cruelly, and madly charged with the crime of burning Rome under Nero, *haud perinde in crimine incendii, quam odio humani generis, convicti sunt.* (*Annal.* xv. 44.) He had before, in the same chapter, characterised their religion, as *exitiabilis superstitio*. Suetonius (*Nero*, 16.) says, *Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis nove ac malefice.* *Ed.*] Because such as could not endure the sacred rites and the religion of the Romans, nor those of all the world, seemed to be the foes of mankind, and to indulge hatred towards all nations.

¹ [The primitive Christians undoubtedly had no order among them designated as the *priesthood*, in the New Testament. But reasonings built upon this fact have sometimes gone too far. The *presbyters* of the apostolic epistles, may fairly be considered as representatives, in some respects, of the Mosaic priests, although the sacrificial duties of these latter, which were their great distinction, are, in strict accuracy, no more. Even this, however, some Christians are unwilling to admit, maintaining a proper, material sacrifice in the eucharist, and hence claiming a character strictly sacerdotal, for those who have authority to administer that sacrament. *Ed.*]

could not want, without being commonly considered by ignorant people as destitute of all religion. Such, however, as apparently denied the gods, or God altogether, were even by the Roman laws accounted pests of the human race. Besides, the worship of so many deities found good livings for a countless throng of priests, augurs, soothsayers, dealers, and artizans. As all these apprehended want, if Christ's religion should gain the upper hand, they rose up against it with united strength, and wished to exterminate its followers².

§ 8. They, whose interest it was to arrest the progress of Christianity, in order to effect their object the sooner, disseminated among the vulgar the basest calumnies against every thing Christian; to which the populace, generally over fickle and credulous, gave assent. These injuries and calumnies may be learnt from those writers who defended Christianity, in the first ages³. The same persons cunningly persuaded the multitude, that all the calamities, wars, tempests, and diseases, that afflicted mankind, were sent upon them by the angry gods, because the Christians, who contemned their authority, were every where tolerated⁴. Other less weighty causes are here omitted.

§ 9. The various kinds of punishment, both capital and corrective, inflicted upon those who venerated *Christ*, are described by learned men, in works professedly on that subject⁵. The manner of proceeding before the tribunals may be seen in the *Acts of the Martyrs*, in the letters which passed between *Pliny* and *Trajan*, and in other ancient documents⁶. But it is clear, that the mode of proceeding in the courts was not always the same. For the laws of the emperors, by which the magistrates were to be guided, differed importantly at different periods. Thus, at one time, the Christians were carefully sought after;

² See the account of Demetrius the silversmith, *Acts* xix. 25. *Pliny*, *Epist.* lib. x. *Ep.* 97. "The temples, which were almost deserted, begin to be frequented again; and the sacred rites, which had been long neglected, are again performed. — The victims which hitherto had found almost no purchasers, begin to come again to the market," &c.

³ This subject is nearly exhausted by *Chr. Kortholt*, *Paganus Obtricator, seu de Calumniis gentium in Christianos*, in three books, Kilon. 1698, 4to. To which

add *J. J. Huldreich*, *de Calumniis gentium in Christianos*, Tiguri, 1744, 8vo.

⁴ See *Arnobius*, *adversus Gentes*, [and *Tertullian*, *Apologet.* c. 40. *Schl.*]

⁵ *Anton. Gallonius* and *Casp. Sagittarius*, *de Cruciatibus Martyrum*; the latter printed at Jena, 1673, 4to; the best edition of the former is, *Antw.* 1668, 12mo. [Both contain mixtures of the doubtful with the true; for the *Acta Martyrum*, now extant, cannot be relied on. *Mosheim*, *de Reb. Chr.* §c.]

⁶ See *J. H. Boehmer*, *Jus Eccles.*

at another, the judges waited till some one came forward to accuse them. Sometimes the confessing or convicted Christians were hurried forthwith to execution, if they did not renounce their religion: at other times, the magistrates laboured, by various species of torture and cruelty, to induce them to apostatize.

§ 10. Those who fell in these perilous days of the church, slain by punishments of various kinds, were called *Martyrs*; a term borrowed from the sacred writings, and denoting that they were *witnesses* for *Christ*. Those who risked life in professing *Christ* before the magistrates, or for his sake incurred the loss of health, or goods, or honours, were denominated *confessors*. Both obtained immense veneration and influence among the Christians; which gave them prerogatives and honours, altogether peculiar and extraordinary; such, indeed, as might furnish matter for a volume that would be useful in various respects. These prerogatives were undoubtedly conferred to make others more readily encounter evils of every kind for *Christ's* sake⁷. But as all peculiar privileges, by the fault of men, have a tendency to degenerate into sources of evil, so these too, not unfrequently, were improperly used: they found likewise food for superstition and other evils.

§ 11. That a great number of persons of every kind and condition suffered death for the sake of *Christ*, during the first three or four centuries, no impartial person acquainted with those times can entertain a doubt. But, since *Henr. Dodwell* ventured upon shaking this ancient opinion⁸, there have been many who maintain with him, that only a *few* actually suffered death on account of the Christian religion; others, however, vehemently oppose this view as a reflection on assistance from above. Those who take the middle path between these two extremes, will pro-

Protest. tom. iv. lib. v. Decretal. Tit. i. § 32.

⁷ [This seems quite too philosophical an account of this matter. The early Christians did not, thus coldly, calculate distant consequences and effects, in order to determine what place in their affections, and what rank in the church, they should give to their brethren and pastors who suffered and died for their religion. Nature, religion, and all the ties which united them to *Christ*, to the church, and to one another, combined to render these holy men and consistent Christians

venerable and lovely in their eyes; and of course to procure them a rank and privileges in the church altogether peculiar. Whoever reads the most authentic accounts of the ancient martyrs, of Polycarp, for instance, will see abundant evidence of the operation of these causes; but nothing of that calculating policy of which Dr. Mosheim speaks. *Tr.*]

⁸ In his noted dissertation, *de Paucitate Martyrum*, which is the eleventh among his *Dissert. Cyprianicæ*.

bably come nearest to the truth. The *martyrs* were not so numerous as they were anciently supposed to be, and as some still account them; but they were more numerous than *Dodwell* and his friends suppose them. Into this opinion, I think, they will the more readily come, who may observe that ancient books do not represent all Christians whatsoever as promiscuously harassed and put upon their trials, even in the church's most arduous times. Persons in the humbler conditions of life were generally more safe; while greater danger impended over the rich, (whose wealth had charms for the judges,) over the learned also, the doctors and heads of churches, lastly over such as were talented and eloquent⁹.

§ 12. The words and actions of the martyrs, from the time of their arrest till their last moments, were carefully committed to writing, with a view of reading them on certain days as models to posterity. But only a few of these *Acta Martyrum* have reached us¹; much the greater part of them having been committed to the flames, during the ten years' war of *Diocletian* against the Christians, when imperial orders required all the books and papers of Christians to be collected and burned. From the eighth century, indeed, both Greeks and Latins have used much diligence in compiling lives of the ancient martyrs; that most of them relate fables coloured with an infusion of rhetoric, is admitted by the sounder heads even in the Roman church. Nor is more credit due to those catalogues of saints, called *Martyrologies*, which have either been compiled by ignorant and incompetent men, or since much falsified. Hence this part of ecclesiastical history enjoys very little light.

§ 13. *Nero* was the first emperor that persecuted the Christians; and his cruelty was extreme. He accused those innocent people of a crime which he himself had committed; namely, that of setting fire to the city of Rome². To make, therefore, punishment correspond with crime, he caused many of them to illumine the streets of his capital, at night, by enveloping their

⁹ [See *Martyrium Polycarpi*, § 12. *Acta Fructuosi*, in *Ruinart's Acta Martyr. sincera*, p. 219. *Cyprian, Epist.* v. and xiv. p. 10 and 23, ed. *Benedict*, and many others. *Mosheim, de Reb. Christ. ante C. M.* p. 106. *Tr.*]

¹ Such of them as are not wholly unworthy of credit were collected in a

moderate sized folio, by *Theod. Ruinart, Selecta et sincera Martyrum Acta*, Amstelod. 1713.

² See the two French dissertations of *Alph. de Vignoles*, on the cause and the commencement of *Nero's* persecution; in *Phil. Masson's Histoire critique de la République des Lettres*, tom. viii. p.

bodies in a mass of fire³. Others he slew in various other ways. This persecution began in the middle of November A.D. 64¹. In it, the ancients tell us, *Paul* and *Peter* suffered death at Rome: but many cannot bring themselves to believe this, because of its repugnance to chronology⁴. This persecution terminated at the death of Nero, who is well known to have been

74—117, and tom. ix. p. 172—186. See also Toimard on Lactantius *de Mortibus Persecutorum*, p. 398.

³ ["Et pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum tergis connecti, laniatu canum interirent, aut crucibus affixi, aut flammam, atque ubi defecisset dies, in usum nocturni luminis uterentur." (Tacit. *Annal.* xv. 44.) This last refinement of wanton cruelty was perpetrated by inclosing the miserable victim, kept upright by a stake, under his chin, in a vest smeared with combustible substances, and setting fire to it. Juvenal is thought to glance at Nero's fiend-like play in this instance, in the well-known lines,

"Pone Tigellinum: taeda lucebis in illa,

Qua stantes ardent, qui fixo guttore fumant."

Sat. i. 155.

Gifford thus renders these lines,—

"But glance at Tigellinus, and you shine,

Chain'd to a stake, in pitchy robes, and light,

Lugubrious torch, the deepening shades of night."

In a note he adds, "The dreadful conflagration which laid waste great part of Rome in the reign of Nero, was found to have broken out in the house of Tigellinus. As his intimacy with the emperor was no secret, it strengthened the general belief, that the city was burned by design. Nothing seems to have enraged Nero so much as this discovery, and to avert the odium from his favourite, he basely taxed the Christians with setting fire to his house." *Ed.*]

⁴ Sebast. Tillemont, *Histoire des Empereurs*, tom. i. p. 564, &c. and Baratrier, *de Successione Romanor. Pontif.* cap. v. p. 60. [All agree that both these apostles, Paul and Peter, were put to death in the reign of Nero: but in respect to the year and place, there is controversy. Many question whether both suffered at the same time. They be-

lieve, according to the testimony of Prudentius, (*Peristephan. de passione beator. Apostolor. Petri et Pauli*, v. 5, 6,) that Peter suffered one year earlier than Paul; but on the same day. As to the day on which Paul suffered, some make it the 29th of June; and others, the 23rd of February. The year is, by some, determined to A.D. 64, so von Hedschei, *Acta Sanctor.* April. tom. i. D. Papebroech, *Propylæum ad Acta S. May.* Anton. Pagi, *Critica in Annal. Baron.* tom. i. p. 51, 52. [Pagi is decided for A.D. 65,] by others, A.D. 65, and again by others A.D. 67, so Baumgarten; and lastly by others, A.D. 68, so John Pearson, *Annales Paulini*, p. 25, which is the most probable opinion. The day when both apostles suffered, was probably the 22nd of February. That Paul was beheaded during Nero's persecution, is supported by the testimony of Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* l. ii. c. 25, and of Lactantius, *de Mortibus Persecutorum*, cap. ii. p. 1375, ed. Büchman. As to the place, an obscure writer, Ulr. Valenus, in a book *Quo Petrus Roman non cenisse demonstratur*, 1660, 4to, p. 40, denies that either apostle suffered at Rome, and endeavours to prove, that their martyrdom was at Jerusalem: which also Bale maintains in regard to Peter, *Centur. Scriptor. Britan.* p. 16. This opinion is confuted by various writers, who are mentioned in *Waleh's Biblioth. theol. selecta*, tom. iii. p. 458. On this whole subject, consult W. Cave, *Life of Paul*, c. vii. § 9, p. 424, of his *Antiq. Apostol.* Tillemont, *Mém. pour servir à l'histoire de l'église*, tom. i. pt. ii. note 42, p. 768, and Fabricius, *Codex Apocryph. N. T.* pt. i. p. 450. On the fabulous circumstances related of Paul's martyrdom, see J. G. Waleh's *Hist. Eccl.* N. T. p. 277. Schl.—On the chronology of Paul's life and labours, see Witsii *Mcclenmata Leidensia*, 1703, 4to. Pearson, *Annales Paul.*, the Introductions to the N. T. by Eichhorn, Bertholt, Horne, &c. and other works referred to in Winer's *Biblisches Realw. art. Paul. Tr.*]

his own executioner, A.D. 68. For about *four years*, therefore, the Christians suffered every species of cruelty at his hands.

§ 1-1. How far the persecution under *Nero* extended, is not agreed among the learned. For, while the greater number suppose it to have spread over the whole Roman empire, there are not wanting others who bound it by the limits of the capital. The former opinion, which is the ancient one⁵, appearing the better supported, we have no hesitation in agreeing with such as think that public laws were enacted against the whole body of Christians, and sent moreover into the provinces. To this opinion we are led, among other reasons, by the authority of *Tertullian*, who clearly intimates that *Nero* and *Domitian* enacted laws against the Christians, which *Trajan* so much mitigated as to render them inoperative⁶. The noted Spanish or Portuguese inscription, in which *Nero* is commended for having purged the province of the *new superstition*, being suspected by the Spaniards themselves, I am unwilling to accept as evidence⁷. The Christians moreover were condemned rather as incendiaries, than on religious grounds⁸. But who can suppose that a sect,

⁵ The first who rejected the common opinion, so far as I know, was Fran. Baldwin, [an eminent civilian of Paris, who died A.D. 1573,] in his *Comment. ad edicta Imperator. in Christianos*, p. 27, 28. After him, Jo. Launoï, in *Diss. qua Salpitiæ Sercri locus de prima martyrum Gallie epocha vindicatur*, § 1, p. 139, 140, tom. ii. pt. i. of his works. Still more learned, and on the same side, was Henry Dodwell, *Diss.* xi. in his *Dissert. Cypricæ*, § xiii. p. 59, whom many others have followed; [among whom, are Jo. le Clerc, *Hist. Eccles. N. T.* Century i. p. 423. Joach. Lange, *Hist. Eccles.* p. 360. Nicol. Gurtler, *Syst. theol. prophet.* p. 491. Baumgarten, *Auszug der Kirchengesch.* vol. i. p. 376 (who supposes the persecution extended only so far as the power of the *Prætorian Præfect*). D. Semler, *Sch. Capita Hist. Eccles.* tom. i. p. 24. (Also J. E. C. Schmidt, *Handbuch der christl. Kirchengesch.* vol. i. p. 120, and A. Neander, *Allgem. Gesch. der christl. Kirch.* vol. i. pt. i. p. 137. *Tr.*) —The arguments for both opinions are stated in J. G. Walch, *Hist. Eccles.* p. 543, who thinks the question to be altogether doubtful. Jablonsky was of the same sentiment, *Institut. Historiæ Christ. antiq.* p. 40. *Schli.*]

⁶ *Tertullian, Apologet.* cap. iv. p. 46, edit. Havercamp.

⁷ This inscription may be seen in J. Gruterus, *Inscriptionum* tom. i. p. cxxxviii. n. 9. [It is this: "Neroni, ob provinciam latronibus et his qui novam generi humano superstitionem inculcabant, purgatam." *Tr.*] But the best Spanish writers do not venture to defend the authority of this inscription; because it has not been seen by any one; and Cyriac of Ancona, who first produced it, is acknowledged by all to be unworthy of credit. I will subjoin the decision of that excellent and judicious historian of Spain, Jo. de Ferreras, *Histoire générale d'Espagne*, tom. i. p. 192. "I cannot refrain from remarking, that Cyriac of Ancona was the first that published the inscription, and that from him all others had derived it. But as the credibility of this writer is suspected in the judgment of all the learned, and as not a vestige nor any recollection of this inscription remains, in the places where it is said to have been found, and no one knows now where to find it; every one may form such opinion of it as he pleases."

⁸ See Theod. Ruinart, *Præf. ad Acta Martyrum sincera et selecta*, p. xxxi. &c.

which the emperor charged with so great an enormity, was tolerated by him patiently out of Rome⁹?

§ 15. Nero being dead, the fury of this first war against the

⁹ [Nearly all the facts relating to this persecution, except the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, we owe to Tacitus, the Roman historian. *Annals*, lib. xv. c. 44. After describing the conflagration, which utterly consumed three of the fourteen wards, and spread ruin in seven others, and likewise the efforts of Nero to soothe the indignant and miserable citizens, he says, "But no human aid, no munificence of the prince, nor expiations of the gods, removed from him the infamy of having ordered the conflagration. Therefore, to stop the clamour, Nero falsely accused and subjected to the most exquisite punishments, a people hated for their crimes, called Christians. The founder of the sect, Christ, was executed in the reign of Tiberius, by the procurator Pontius Pilate. The pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, burst forth again; not only through Judea, the birth-place of the evil, but at Rome also, where every thing atrocious and base centres and is in repute. Those first seized, confessed; then a vast multitude, detected by their means, were convicted, not so much of the crime of burning the city, as of hatred to mankind. And insult was added to their torments; for being clad in skins of wild beasts, they were torn to pieces by dogs; or affixed to crosses to be burned, were used as lights, to dispel the darkness of night, when the day was gone. Nero devoted his gardens to the show, and held Circensian games, mixing with the rabble, or mounting a chariot, clad like a coachman. Hence, though the guilty and those meriting the severest punishment suffered; yet compassion was excited, because they were destroyed, not for the public good, but to satisfy the cruelty of an individual."—It appears from this account that a vast multitude (*multitudo ingens*) suffered at Rome,—and suffered in a most inhuman manner;—that they were *falsely accused*, and by Nero's instigation; not because he had any thing against them, but because they were a despised people, and he hoped to avert the public odium from himself. But the case was too plain; their innocence was known, and Nero's fiend-like merriment only raised compassion towards them, and increased the odium against him. It is

clear, from this account, that the Christians, in the opinion of Tacitus, deserved to be exterminated for their religion; yet that Nero did not proceed on this ground, but on the *false charge* of their having kindled the fires of Rome. Lactantius, then, (*de Mortibus Persecutorum*, cap. ii.) erred in attributing other designs to Nero, namely, the extermination of the Christian religion. The commencement of this persecution is determined by the time of the conflagration, which Tacitus says (*Annals*, xv. 33, 41,) began the 18th of July, A.D. 65, (or xiv. *Kalend. Sextiles*; C. Lccanio et M. Licinio Coss.) and lasted six days. Some time after, but in the same year, the persecution broke out. But how long it continued, is uncertain. If Paul and Peter suffered in the very last year of Nero's reign, as the fathers state, (Eusebius, *Chronicon*; and Jerome, *de Viris illustr.* c. i. and v.) the persecution doubtless ceased, only on Nero's death. But if they suffered earlier, then we have no proof of the continuance of the persecution so long.—As to the extent of the persecution, it is wholly in the dark. If we consider simply the description of it, or the causes from which it originated, and the feelings of Nero towards the Christians, we have no reason to suppose it extended beyond the city of Rome and its neighbourhood. Yet the general impression in former ages, and the belief of many in this age, make the persecution a general one. The only argument of much plausibility for this opinion is derived from a passage in Tertullian, (*Apologet.* cap. iv. p. 46, ed. Havercamp.) where he speaks of the persecuting laws of the empire, as being enacted by the very vilest and most odious among the emperors, and mentions Nero as the first that "*drew the sword*" against the Christians; and Domitian as the second who did so. Whence it is inferred, that Nero, as well as Domitian, must have enacted public laws against the Christians; and of course, that the persecution in Nero's reign must have been general, or throughout the empire. But considering the fervid, rhetorical style of Tertullian, this seems to be a slender foundation, on which to ground a conclusion, that has no support from well-attested facts. *Tr.*]

Christians ceased. But in the year 93 or 94¹, a new assault was made upon them by *Domitian*, an emperor little behind Nero in flagitious acts². The cause of the persecution, if we may credit *Hegesippus*, was fear of losing the throne: for the emperor had heard, some way or other, that a man would arise from among the relatives of *Christ*, bent upon revolution and political disturbance³. This persecution, undoubtedly, was severe, but the emperor's assassination soon afterwards rendered it brief⁴. The principal martyrs named, are, *Flavius Clemens*, a consul, and *Flavia Domitilla*⁵, his niece or wife. In the midst of this persecution, *John*, the apostle, was banished to the isle of Patmos;

¹ [The precise year, in which the persecution by Domitian began, is not certain. Toinard has discussed the point in his notes on Lactantius *de Mortibus Persecutorum*, cap. iii. That it raged in the year 93, is stated by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 18, but how long before this it commenced, is not clear.—Pagi (*Crit. Annal. Baron.* tom. i. p. 85, 87,) supposes it began A.D. 93. Toinard, *ubi supra*, A.D. 94, and Dodwell, (*Diss. Cypricæ.* xi. p. 71,) A.D. 95. Mosheim (*de Rebb. Christ. ante C. M.*) says A.D. 94 or 95. *Tr.*]

² See Theod. Rainart, *Præf. ad Acta Martyrum*, p. xxxii. [Thom. Ittig, *Selecta Hist. Eccles. capita*, sæcul. i. cap. 6, § 11, p. 531. *Schl.*]

³ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* i. iii. c. 19, 20. [In this simple, unvarnished story, there is nothing difficult to be believed. It is therefore credible, that some enemy of both Jews and Christians suggested to the emperor, that the Jews were expecting a king of David's line, who would give laws to the world; and that the Christians likewise believed, that Christ would re-appear, and set up a splendid kingdom; that from both these classes of people, insurrections and trouble were to be feared; and that the tyrant, enraged by the suggestions of the insidious foe, ordered all the posterity of David to be sought out and to be put to death; and to prevent the Christians from making disturbance, he commanded them to be put under restraints, or to be punished with severity. Mosheim, *de Rebb. Christ.* &c. p. 111.]

⁴ [The termination of this persecution is stated differently by the ancients. Some say, that Domitian himself put an end to it before his death. Hegesippus (in Eusebius, *Ecl. Hist.* i. iii. c. 20,)

states that Domitian having learned that there were Christians of the lineage of David, and kinsmen of Christ, still living in Palestine, had them brought to Rome, and interrogated them closely respecting their pedigree, their wealth, and the future kingdom of Christ; and from their answers and their whole appearance he concluded he had nothing to fear from them, and dismissed them; and thereupon, he published a decree, terminating the persecution. So likewise, Tertullian (*Apologet.* cap. v. p. 60,) says of Domitian, "He receded from his attempt, and recalled those he had banished." But Lactantius (*de Mortibus Persecutorum*, cap. 3,) represents his acts and edicts as repealed *after his death*, when it was that the church recovered its former state. And Xiphilin, on Nerva, (*Dion Cassius*, l. lxxviii. c. 1, abridged by Xiphilin,) says, that "Nerva recalled those banished for impiety," i. e. the Christians. Perhaps Domitian published an edict favourable to the Christians, a little before his death, the benefits of which they began to enjoy, first, after his decease. *Schl.*] "Tertullian says, that Domitian's persecution was of short duration, and that the emperor himself put a stop to it." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 115. *Ed.*

⁵ [See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* i. iii. c. 18, and *Chronicon*, ann. 95. Some have supposed, that the wife and niece of Clemens both had the same name; and that the first was banished to the island of *Pandataria*, near Italy; and the second, to another island called *Pontia*. See Tillemont, *Mém. pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. p. 124, &c., and Fleury, *History of the Church*, lib. ii. § 52. *Schl.*]

but whether, first, after being cast into a body of oil on fire, by order of the emperor, he came out alive and unhurt, though *Tertullian* and others say so, many think uncertain ⁶.

⁶ See the amicable discussion between the Rev. Mr. Heumann and myself, in my *Synagoga Diss. ad historiam eccles. pertinentium*, tom. i. p. 497—546. [The whole controversy seems to rest on a passage in *Tertullian*, *de Præscript. ad. Marc.* c. 36, as the only original authority for the story, which is, in itself, improbable. All the more discerning, of late, either doubt or deny the truth of the

story. *Tr.*] *Tertullian's* words are *Apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus, nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur.* Such a brief and incidental notice of a circumstance, in itself very unlikely, by a writer who was not born until fifty years or more after its alleged occurrence, is obviously quite insufficient for establishing it. *Ed.*]

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. The state of philosophy in the East, little known.—§ 2. Philosophy of the Persians, Chaldeans, and Arabians.—§ 3. Jewish and Egyptian wisdom.—§ 4. The proper oriental philosophy.—§ 5. Its first principles.—§ 6. Its patrons not agreed in their opinions.—§ 7. Its precepts concerning God.—§ 8. Concerning the origin of the world.—§ 9. Concerning human souls.—§ 10. The Jewish philosophy.—§ 11. Grecian learning.—§ 12. Roman learning and philosophy.—§ 13. Attention to science in other nations.

§ 1. IF it were known what opinions were advanced and maintained, by the men of most intelligence among the oriental nations, at the time when the Christian religion began to enlighten mankind, many things in the early history of the church might be more fully and more accurately explained. But only a few fragments of oriental philosophy, as all know, have come down to us; and those which have reached us still need a learned man to collect them all, arrange them properly, and expound them sagaciously¹.

§ 2. The prevailing system in Persia was that of the Magi; who, as is well known, placed over this universe two principles, or deities, one good, the other evil. Their followers, however, were not agreed, as to the precise nature of these first principles². Nevertheless, this doctrine spread over no small portion of Asia and Africa, particularly among the Chaldeans, Assyrians,

¹ There is extant an English work of Thomas Stanley, on the *History of Oriental Philosophy*, which J. le Clerc translated into Latin. But that learned man has left the field of oriental philosophy not to be gleaned only, but to be reaped, by others. He is much inferior,

both in genius and erudition, to Ja. Brucker, whose *History of Philosophy* should by all means be consulted.

² See Tho. Hyde, *Historia religionis veterum Persarum*, Oxon. 1700, 4to,—a very learned work, but ill digested, and full of improbable conjectures.

Syrians, and Egyptians, though under modifications; nor did it leave even the Jews untinged with its principles³. The Arabians of that age, and long afterwards, were more remarkable for strength and courage than intellectual culture. They gained, indeed, no great credit in literature before *Mahomet*. This their own writers do not deny⁴.

§ 3. The Indians, from very early times, were much famed for their love of profound knowledge. Of their philosophical tenets we could perhaps form an opinion, at the present day, if their very ancient sacred book which they denominate *Veda*, or *the law*, were brought to light, and translated into some one of the better known languages. The accounts given by travellers among the Indians, concerning this book, are so contradictory and fluctuating, that we must wait for further information⁵.

³ See Jo. Christoph. Wolf, *Manichæismus ante Manichæos*, Hamb. 1707, 8vo, —also Mosheim, Notes on Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, p. 328, 423, &c.

⁴ See Abulpharajus, *de Moribus Arabum*, p. 6, published by Pocock.

⁵ I have recently learned, that this most desirable book has been obtained by some French Jesuits residing in India, and that it has been, or will be, deposited in the king of France's library. See *Lettre du P. Calmette à M. de Cartigny, dans des Lettres édifiantes et curieuses des Miss. Étrangères*, xxi. Recueil, p. 455, &c. and xxiii. Rec. p. 161.—[The Hindoo literature and theology were little known when Dr. Mosheim wrote. Since that time, and especially since the establishment of the Asiatic Society at Calcutta, by Sir Wm. Jones in 1793, this field of knowledge has been explored with equal industry and success. See the *Asiatic Researches*, 13 vols. 4to, Sir Wm. Jones's *Works*, 6 vols. 4to, Rev. Wm. Ward's *View of the Hist. &c. of the Hindoos*, 3 vols. 8vo, and numerous other works.—But it is not true, that the *Vedas* have been brought to Europe, as Dr. Mosheim had been informed. On the contrary, Mr. Holbrooke, in the 8th vol. of the *Asiatic Res.*, describes them as not worth translating. He says: "They are too voluminous for a complete translation of the whole; and what they contain would hardly reward the labour of the reader, much less that of the translator." The *Vedas* are four in number, called Rig Veda, Yajush Veda, Sama Veda, and Atharvan Veda. The first consists of 5

sections, in 10,000 verses; the second is divided into 80 sections, in 9000 verses; the third consists of 100 sections, and 3000 verses; the fourth, of 9 sections, with subdivisions, and 6000 verses. Besides the four Vedas, the Hindoos have fourteen other sacred books, of later date and inferior authority; viz. four Upavedas, six Angas, and four Upangas. All these were supposed to be the production of divine persons, and to contain all true knowledge secular as well as sacred. The commentaries on these books, the compilations from them, and digests of their principles, are almost innumerable, and constitute the whole encyclopædia of the Hindoos. Several of these have been translated into European languages: namely, *L'Eclaircissement de la Véda*, or *ancien commentaire du Vedam*, &c. à Yverdon, 1788, 2 vols. 12mo.—The *Bhagvat-Geeta*, or *Dialogues of Kreesna and Arjoon*, in eighteen Lectures, with notes by Cha. Wilkins, Lond. 1785, 4to.—*Bagaradam, ou doctrine divine, oucraie Indien canonique sur l'Être suprême, les dieux, les géans, les hommes, les diversés parties de l'univers*, (by Foucher d'Obsonville), à Paris, 1788, 8vo.—*Oupnekhat, h. e. decretum legendum, opus ipsa in India rarissimum, continens antiquam et arcanam, seu theolog. et philosoph. doctrinam, e quatuor sacris Indorum libris excerptam,—e Persico idiomate in Latinum versum,—studio et opere Anquetil du Perron*, 1801—2, 2 vols. 4to.—*Institutes of Hindoo Law, or the ordinances of Menu*, translated by Sir Wm. Jones, Lond. 1796, 8vo. The last is supposed to follow next after the Vedas

The Egyptians were unquestionably divided into various sects, disagreeing in opinion⁶: wherefore they seem to labour in vain, who would reduce the philosophy of this people to one consistent system.

§ 4. But of all the philosophic systems that were received in Asia and part of Africa during our Saviour's age, no one occasioned more injury to the interests of Christianity, than that which bore the name of *Gnosis*⁷, that is, *the way to a true knowledge of God*, and which has been already styled by us the *Oriental*, to distinguish it from the Grecian philosophy. From this school issued the founders and leaders of those sects, which during the three first centuries occasioned most of the difficulties and uneasinesses in Christian affairs. In striving to make Christ's simple and most holy wisdom agree with the precepts of that philosophy which they had imbibed, men gave birth to various and surprising dreams, obtruding doctrines upon their followers, that were some of them ludicrous, others intricate and obscure to a strange degree. The ancient Greek and Latin fathers, who contended against these sects, found an origin for them in the principles of *Plato*; but those good men, being acquainted with no philosophy but the Grecian, and ignorant

in age. Sir Wm. Jones thinks it was, most probably, compiled about 880 years before Christ; and the Vedas about 300 years earlier. The other sacred books of the Hindoos are much later; yet all are now ancient. From the similarity of views between the Hindoo philosophers and those of Greece, it has been thought that they must have had some intercourse, or that one borrowed from the other. The ideas of the fathers in the Christian church, and of some moderns, would make the Greeks indebted to the Orientals,—but Christoph. Meiners (*Historia doctrinae de uno Deo*) and others would reverse the stream of philosophic knowledge, by supposing it followed the march of Alexander's army, from Greece to India. This intercourse between the Indians and the Greeks, seems not to have been of long continuance. If it commenced with Alexander's Indian expedition, it can scarcely have lasted 80 years; for the conquest of Media, Persia, and Babylonia, by the Parthians, about 250 years before Christ, and the establishment of their empire in those countries, formed a strong barrier to all

further intercourse; and the subversion of the kingdom of the Seleucide by the Romans, B.C. 65, must be supposed to be the utmost limits to which it *could* extend. If we consider the flourishing state of the Grecian philosophy before the Asiatic conquests of Alexander, and the silence of the western philosophers respecting their intercourse with India during the period supposed, it would seem more probable, that the Indian philosophy was derived from the Grecian, than the latter from the former. It is to be hoped, this subject will receive more light from the investigations which are going forward with such success, in the present age. *Tr.*

⁶ See Dr. Mosheim's notes on Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, tom. i. p. 415.

⁷ [*Γνῶσις*, Gr. *knowledge*; by way of eminence. Hence pretenders to this kind of *knowledge* were called *Gnostics*, or *knowing ones*. "It was a leading tenet of Gnosticism, that the supreme God was unknown before the coming of Christ." Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, 36, note. *Ed.*]

of every thing oriental, were deceived by a certain relationship between some of the *Platonic* opinions, and such as were current in the east. Whoever compares the *Platonic* philosophy carefully with the *Gnostic*, will readily see that they are widely different⁸.

§ 5. The first principles of this philosophy seem to have been the dictates of mere reason. For the author of it undoubtedly thus argued: Many are the evils in this universe, and men are

⁸ [Dr. Mosheim in this and the four following sections, describes an *oriental philosophy*, the supposed parent of the *Gnostic* systems, as if its existence was universally admitted, and its character well understood. Yet the system here described, is of his own formation; being such a system as must have existed, according to his judgment, in order to account for the *Gnosticism* of the early ages. In his *Comment. de Rebus Christ. &c.* p. 19—21, and in his *Diss. de Causis suppositorum librorum inter Christianos sæculi primi et secundi*, § 3—6, (inter *Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinentes*, vol. i. p. 223—232,) he confesses that he has little evidence, except the necessity of the supposition, for the existence of this philosophy. He also admits, that the fathers knew nothing of it; and he might have added, that they testify that *Gnosticism* had no existence, till the days of Adrian, in the second century. Since Dr. Mosheim wrote, some few have believed with him; others have rejected his hypothesis altogether; and others again have taken a middle course, which is probably the nearest to the truth. These last suppose, that the Jews, and the Greeks of Asia and Egypt, imbibed something of the *spirit*, common to most of the *Asiatic* wise men, and which shows itself in the *Brahminic*, the *Zoroastrian*, and the *Sufi* or *Persian* speculations; namely, a disposition to indulge the imagination, and to depend on contemplation rather than ratiocination, as the means of arriving at truth. Something of this *spirit* appears also in the *Platonic* philosophy, especially in the later or *Eclectic* *Platonism*. Besides, the *Asiatics* in all ages, like the early *Grecian* philosophers, were much inclined to limit their philosophical speculations to *cosmogony*; and likewise to adopt, as the supposed first or grand operative cause, a *physical*, rather than an intelligent principle; or in other words, to attri-

bute the origin of all things, to generation, rejection, emanation, attraction, or some such natural operation, rather than to the contrivance and the fiat of an almighty and intelligent Spirit. Hence the Jews, and some early Christian sects, without embracing the peculiar tenets of the Magi, or of any other philosophers, oriental or occidental, yet imbibing the *Asiatic spirit* of searching after wisdom by means of contemplation rather than ratiocination, and at the same time leaning towards the supremacy of physical causes, were led to frame systems of philosophical divinity altogether peculiar. Such was, probably, the origin of the Jewish *Cabbalistic* system; and also of those multifarious systems, which bore the common name of *Gnosticism*. Elaborate attempts have been made to trace these systems back to some species of pagan philosophy as their legitimate source, but with very little success. They seem to have originated in the speculations of Jews and Christians, who indulged their own fancies, and explained the principles of revealed religion in a manner peculiar to themselves. That *Gnosticism*, as such, had no existence in the first century, and that it is in vain sought for in the New Testament, appears to be satisfactorily proved, by C. C. Tittmann, *Tractatus de cæstigiis Gnosticorum in N. T. frustra quesitis*, Lips. 1773, pp. 253, 12mo. That notwithstanding many points of resemblance can be traced, it is materially different from any system of either *Grecian* or *oriental* philosophy, it is the object of F. Ant. Lewald to show, *Comment. ad historiam, &c. de doctrina Gnostica*, Heidelberg. 1818, pp. 157, 12mo.—For very ingenious and profound speculations on the subject generally, see Aug. Neander, *Allgem. Gesch. der christl. Religion und Kirche*, vol. i. pt. ii. p. 627—670. Tr.]

borne onwards by a sort of natural impulse to the doing of things that reason condemns. Yet that eternal mind, from which all spirits have emanated, being unquestionably free from every evil quality, is infinitely good and beneficent. Hence the source of the evils with which the world abounds, must be something *external* to the Deity. There is, however, nothing external to Him but matter; this, therefore, must be regarded, as the seat and origin of all evil and vice. From these principles the conclusion was, that matter, like God, has existed from eternity, though not by God's will or command, but by the power and labour of some other nature, inferior to God; that it was formed, as we see it, into the world; and that, the human race was not created by the Supreme Deity, but by one less perfect and powerful. For who can believe, that a God infinitely good, and quite incapable of knowing vice, ever brought matter into shape, bad and vicious as its nature is, and tempered it with a portion of his own perfections? When they attempted, however, to go farther, and find some way of accounting for the chance or contrivance, which had so skilfully worked up that rude and malignant matter, especially for the union of bodies made from it with heavenly spirits, then reason and natural analogies forsook them. The inventive faculty was, therefore, necessarily tasked for some fabulous mode of accounting for the world, and the origin of mankind.

§ 6. But as those who undertake to explain things obscure and difficult by means of mere conjecture, can very seldom agree, so those who attempted to solve this difficulty split into various sects. Some conceived that there must be *two eternal first principles*, the one presiding over *light*, the other over *matter*; and by the contests between these principles, they accounted for the mixture of good and evil in our world. Others assigned to matter, not an *eternal lord*, but an *architect* merely; and they represented one of those immortal beings whom God produced from himself, as impelled by some unforeseen chance to employ himself in reducing to order the matter which lay remote from the residence of God, and in fabricating mankind. Others again set up a sort of triumvirate, considering the supreme Deity to differ not only from the principle of matter, and of all evil, but also from the creator of this world⁹. When

⁹ [This appears to have been the main feature of the religious reformation in-

roduced into Persia, by Zerdusht, or Zoroaster, whom Plutarch places five

these three systems came to be dilated and explained, new controversies unavoidably arose, and numerous divisions followed; as might be expected from the nature of the case, and as the history of those Christian sects which followed this philosophy expressly declares:

§ 7. Yet, as all these sects set out upon one first principle, their disagreements did not prevent them from holding in common certain doctrines and opinions respecting God, the world, mankind, and some other points. Thus they all maintained the existence from eternity of a Being, full of goodness, wisdom, and the other virtues, of whom no mortal can form a complete idea¹,—a Being who is the purest *light*, and is diffused through that boundless *space* to which they gave the Greek appellation of *Pleroma*²; that this eternal and most perfect being, after existing alone and in absolute repose during an infinite period, produced out of himself two spirits, of different sexes, and both perfect resemblances of their parent; that from the marriage of these two spirits, others of a similar nature originated; that successive generations ensued; and thus, in process of time, a *celestial family* was formed in the *Pleroma*. This divine progeny being unchangeable, and quite incapable of perishing, these philosophers chose to impose upon it the name of Αἰὼν, *Æon*, a term which signifies an eternal nature, not liable to time and its vicissitudes³. But how numerous these *Æons* were, was a subject of controversy among them⁴.

thousand years before the Trojan war, but who is thought really to have lived under Darius Hystaspes. — Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 48. *Ed.*]

¹ ["Beside the name of *first Father*, or *first Principle*, they called him also *Bythus*, as if to denote the unfathomable nature of his perfections." — Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 36. *Ed.*]

² "A Greek word which signifies fullness," (*Maccl.*) "Michaelis uses it for a *heaven*, that is, a *place*.—The Easterns conceived a *πλήρωμα*, in the sense of a system, or complete *company*, made up of God and his attendant *αἰῶνες*; also in the sense of a space occupied by them: and it would generally be difficult to say in which of these senses the word was used; for if a man, or superior being, was admitted into the *πλήρωμα*, in the first sense, he would be also in the second. Being admitted into a *company*, is being admitted into the *place* occupied

by that company; as admission into a *family* is admission into the *house* where that family resides." — Hey's *Lectures*, i. 262. *Ed.*]

³ [The word αἰὼν properly signifies an *infinite*, or, at least, indefinite *duration*, and is opposed to a finite or a temporary duration. But by metonymy, it was used to designate immutable *beings* who exist for ever. It was so used, even by the Greek philosophers, about the commencement of the Christian era; as appears from a passage in Arrian, *Diss. Epictet.* lib. ii. § 5, where αἰὼν is opposed to *ἄνθρωπος*, or to a frail, changeable being. Οὐ γὰρ εἰμὶ αἰὼν ἀλλ' ἄνθρωπος, μέρος τῶν πάντων, ὡς ὥρα ἡμέρας: ἐνστήναι με εἰς ὡς τὴν ὥραν, καὶ παρελθεῖν ὡς ὥραν. "I am not an *Æon*, (an eternal and unchangeable being,) but a *man*; and a part of the universe, as an hour is a part of the day; like an hour I must exist, and

§ 8. Beyond the region of light where God and his family dwell⁵, exists a rude and unformed mass of matter, heaving itself continually in wild commotion. This was not only set in order at a certain time by one of the celestial race that had gotten out of the *Pleroma*, either by some chance, or God's direction, but was adorned likewise with men, and other animals of different kinds, with various things besides, and then tempered and corrected with a certain portion of light and celestial matter⁶. This Fabricator of the world, who was distinguished from the supreme Deity, ordinarily bore the name of *Demiurge*⁷. Now, he is one, that with many distinguished qualities, has a natural arrogance, and greediness of rule. He asserts, therefore, a claim of unquestionable right to the empire of that new world, which was constructed by him, wholly excluding the supreme Deity, and requiring divine honours from mankind, for himself and his associates in government.

§ 9. Men were compounded of an earthy and vicious body, joined with a soul, plucked somehow from the Deity himself,

then pass away."—It was therefore not a novel application of the term *αἰών* by the Gnostics, to use it as the designation of a celestial and immortal being. And even the fathers of the ancient church apply the term to *angels*, both good and bad. That *all* who were addicted to the oriental philosophy, whether Greeks or not, used the term in this sense, appears from a passage in Manes, the Persian, who, as Augustine testifies, called the celestial beings *αἰώνες*, or, as Augustine translates it, *secula*. Some have supposed it so used even in the *New Test.* e. g. Ephes. ii. 2, and Heb. i. 2.—Mosheim, *de Reb. Christ. ante C. M.* p. 30.]

⁴ These imaginary beings, called sometimes *Eons*, from their existence before time was, at other times, *Emanations*, from the mode of their production, were represented as more or less numerous, according to different schemes. Each pair was inferior to that which produced it, so that the whole race gradually deteriorated as its members sprang forth at greater distances from the original divine emanator. — Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 36. *Ed.*]

⁵ This view of the heavenly abode may recall that fine passage of the *Paradise Lost*, in which it has often been said, Milton talks like a Manichee :

"Hail, holy light, offspring of heav'n
first born,
Or of the Eternal co-eternal beam,
May I express thee unblam'd! Since
God is light,
And never but in unapproach'd light
Dwelt from eternity, dwelt then in
thee,
Bright effluence of bright essence in-
crease."—B. iii. l. *Ed.*]

⁶ "At length one of the *Eons* passed the limits of the *Pleroma*, and meeting with matter, created the world after the form and fashion of an ideal world, which existed in the *Pleroma*, or in the mind of the supreme God."—Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, 37. *Ed.*]

⁷ That is *Creator*; or, more closely, the *Artificer*. Δημιουργεῖ τὰ μὴ ὄντα ποιῇ.—Δημιουργός χειροτέχνης, κατασκευαστής. (Hesych.) Prometheus, in classical mythology, is evidently the oriental *Demiurge*. He formed men of clay, which Lucian represents as a crime against heaven, and then stole fire from above for their use. The latter charge shows the Greeks to have borrowed the fable without understanding it. Its eastern inventors made their hero steal fire, not for the ordinary use of man, but for animating him with a reasonable soul of heavenly origin. *Ed.*]

and of heavenly kind. Of which parts, the nobler, the soul, that is, miserably suffers under the body, which is the seat of all lusts, being not only drawn away by it from knowing and worshipping the Great Supreme, to the fear and reverence of this world's Creator and his associates, but also filled with love of things that are earthy and please the senses. From this wretched bondage, God labours to rescue his daughters in various ways; and especially by the messengers whom he often sends to them. But the Demiurge and his associates, eager to retain their power, resist, in all possible ways, the divine purpose of recalling souls back to himself, and with great pains obscure all knowledge of the supreme Deity. Meanwhile, such souls as renounce the framers and rulers of this world, lifting themselves up towards their real parent, and repressing the motions excited by depraved matter, go straight, when freed from the body, into the *Pleroma*; while those, which continue in the bondage of superstition and matter, must pass into other bodies, till they are sufficiently aroused. Yet God will ultimately prevail; and having restored to liberty most of the souls now imprisoned in bodies, will dissolve the fabric of the world, the primitive tranquillity will then return, and God will reign with the happy spirits in undisturbed felicity to all eternity.

§ 10. What face¹ was worn among the Jews by learning generally, and by philosophy in particular, may be judged from such things as have been already said in discoursing of that nation. Many in it, we may first remark, as appears from the New Testament itself, taught and preached up, when that book was written, the recondite knowledge which they call *Cabbala*. Now this is a system very near akin in many things to that philosophy which we call *oriental*; or rather, it is this philosophy itself, accommodated to the Jewish religion, and tempered with some mixture of truth². Nor were the Jews, at that time, wholly ignorant of the Grecian doctrines; for some of them had actually been incorporated into their own religion, from the age of *Alexander* the Great. Of the opinions which they had adopted from the Chaldeans, the Egyptians, and the Syrians, I shall say nothing³.

² ["The Jewish *Cabbala* may be loosely defined to be a mystical system, affecting the theory and practice of reli-

gion, founded upon oral tradition."—Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, 51. *Ed.*]

³ See J. F. Buddeus, *Introductio in*

§ 11. The Greeks are regarded, by most writers, as continuing to hold the first rank in learning and philosophy. There were among them, at that time, especially at Athens, acute and eloquent men, who, besides teaching the precepts of philosophy, as held by the ancient sects founded by Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Epicurus, instructed youth in the principles of eloquence and polite literature. So that such as were eager for learning, resorted in great numbers to Greece from all quarters. Nor was there a smaller supply of Greek philosophers and rhetoricians to be found at Alexandria, in Egypt; which caused a similar concourse to that place, as if to a mart of liberal arts.

§ 12. Among the Romans in this age every branch of learning and science was cultivated. The children of good families were, from their earliest years, instructed especially in Grecian learning and eloquence; they next applied themselves to philosophy and jurisprudence; lastly they sought in Greece the higher branches of intellectual cultivation¹. Among the philosophers, none were more acceptable to the Romans than the Epicureans and Academics, whom the leading men followed in great numbers, in order to spend life in pleasure without fear of consequences. While *Augustus* lived, cultivators of elegant literature were in high credit. But after his death, the succeeding emperors being more intent on the arts of war than those of peace, these studies generally sank into neglect.

§ 13. The other nations, as the Germans, Celts, and Britons, were certainly not destitute of men distinguished for their genius and acumen. In Gaul, the inhabitants of Marseilles had long been much famed for their attention to learning²: and they had, doubtless, diffused knowledge among the neighbouring tribes. Among the Celts, the *Druids*, who were priests, philosophers, and legislators, were renowned for their wisdom; but the accounts of them now extant are not sufficient to acquaint us with the nature of their philosophy³. The Romans more-

Historiam Philos. Hebræorum; and the writers named by Wolfius, *Bibliotheca Hebræica*, tom. iii. [but, especially Brucker's *Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. period ii. pt. i. l. ii. c. i. p. 652. *Schell.*]

¹ See Paganini Gaudentii *liber de Philosophia apud Romanos initio et progressu*, in the 5th vol. of the *Nova rariorum scriptorum collectio*, Halle, 1747, 8vo, 2d edition.

² See the *Histoire littéraire de la*

France, par des Religieux Bénédictins, Diss. prelim. p. 42, &c.

³ Ja. Martini, *Religion des Gaulois*, liv. i. cap. 21, p. 175; and various others who have written concerning the Druids. [This work of Martin is said to be far inferior to the following: viz. *Histoire des Celtes et particulièrement des Gaulois et des Germains*, par Sim. Pelloutier, augmentée par M. de Chinac, Paris, 1771, 8 vols. 12mo, and 2 vols. 4to—also

over introduced literature and philosophy into all the countries which they brought under their subjection, with a view of softening the popular manners, and gradually bringing about civilization⁴.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS, AND OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Necessity of teachers in the church.—§ 2. Extraordinary teachers.—§ 3. Authority of the apostles.—§ 4. The seventy disciples.—§ 5. Christ nowhere determined the form of his church. Constitution of the church of Jerusalem.—§ 6. Rights of the people. Contributions for the public expense.—§ 7. Equality of the members. Rites of initiation. Catechumens and the faithful.—§ 8. Order of rulers. Presbyters.—§ 9. Prophets.—§ 10. Deacons of the church at Jerusalem. Deaconesses.—§ 11. Bishops.—§ 12. Character of episcopacy in this century.—§ 13. Origin of dioceses, and rural bishops.—§ 14. Whether there were councils and metropolitans in the *first* century.—§ 15. The principal writers; the apostles.—§ 16. Time of completion of the canon.—§ 17. Apocryphal writings and *pseudepigrapha*.—§ 18. Clemens Romanus.—§ 19. Writings falsely ascribed to him.—§ 20. Ignatius of Antioch.—§ 21. Polycarp, Barnabas, Hermas.—§ 22. Character of the apostolic fathers.

§ 1. As it was our Saviour's will to collect a society for himself out of all the nations in the earth, which too should continually keep increasing, he necessarily began by choosing certain individuals to act as his *ambassadors* to the human race, and as *extraordinary teachers*. After these had established religious bodies everywhere, it was needful for him to provide for placing *ordinary teachers*, and interpreters of his will, in the societies that had been formed, who should not only repeat the doctrines which were learnt from the *extraordinary* ones, but also keep the people to their faith and practice. For any religion will gradually be corrupted and become extinct, unless there are persons continually at hand, who shall explain and inculcate it.

Fréret, *Obs. sur la nature et les dogmes de la relig. Gauloise*; in the *Histoire de l'Acad. des Inscript.* tome xviii.—and his *Obs. sur la relig. des Gaulois*, &c. in the *Mémoires de Littérature, tirés des registres de l'Acad. des Inscript.* tome xxiv. Paris,

1756.—Also the introductory part of *Alsatia Illustrata*, autore J. Dan. Schoepflino, tom. i. § 96. Colmar. 1751, fol. *Tr.*]

⁴ Juvenal, *Satyra* xv. 110—113.

§ 2. The *extraordinary* teachers, whom *Christ* employed in setting up his kingdom, were those intimate friends of his whom the Scriptures denominate *apostles*; and those *seventy disciples*, of whom mention was made above. To these, I apprehend, must be added those who are called *evangelists*; that is, as I suppose, those who were either sent forth to instruct the people by the apostles, or who, of their own accord, forsaking other employments, assumed the office of promulgating the truths which *Christ* taught¹. And to these, we must further add those to whom, in the infancy of the church, God imparted ability to speak in foreign languages which they had never learned. For he on whom the divine goodness conferred the *gift of tongues*, was bound, in my judgment, to infer from the thing itself, that God designed to employ *his* ministry in propagating the Christian religion².

§ 3. Many have undertaken to write the history of the *apostles*; although it is a theme replete with fables, doubts, and difficulties, when we take leave of the particulars that are found in the books of the New Testament, and in the more ancient writers of Christian affairs³. Now, an apostle was a man *divinely instructed*, and sent by *Christ* to mortals, with the power of *making laws*, *coercing the guilty and depraved*, when it should seem advisable, and of *working miracles* besides, when there should appear occasion for them. Thus he was to make known every where the divine will, and the way of salvation, separating such as obeyed God's voice from the remaining crowd, and binding them together by the tie of a society⁴.

§ 4. Our knowledge of the *seventy disciples* of *Christ*, is still more imperfect than that of the apostles; for they are but once mentioned in the New Testament⁵. Catalogues of them, indeed, are extant; but these being made up by the later

¹ Ephes. iv. 11. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iii. c. 37.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 22, &c.

³ Writers of the lives of the apostles are enumerated by Casp. Sagittarius, *Introductio ad historiam eccles.* cap. i. p. 2; and by J. Fr. Buddeus, *de Ecclesia Apostolica*, p. 673, &c. [Some notices of their lives are given above, in notes 7 and 8, p. 58—60. Tr.]

⁴ See Fred. Spanheim, *de Apostolis et Apostolatu*, tom. ii. Opp. p. 289, &c. In ascribing legislative powers to the

apostles, I have proceeded considerably, and, as I think, on good grounds. I am aware that eminent men, at this day, deny them this power; but, perhaps they differ from me more in words than in reality. [Dr. Mosheim founded his opinion on Matt. x. 20; John xiii. 20; Luke x. 16; 1 Tim. iii. 1; 1 Cor. xi. 1—4, 34; and Titus i. 5. See his *Instit. hist. Christ. majores*, p. 158, &c. *Schl.*]

⁵ Luke x. 1.

Greeks, have little or no authority and credibility. Their mission was, as appears plain from the very words of *Luke*, solely to the Jewish nation. Yet it is very probable, that after the Saviour's ascension to heaven, they performed the duties of *evangelists*, and taught, in various countries, the way of salvation which they had learned from *Christ*°.

§ 5. As to the external *form* of the church and the mode of governing it, neither *Christ* himself nor his apostles gave any express precepts. We are therefore to understand, that a very large portion of this thing is committed to the times, and to the prudence of those who direct public affairs in both their branches⁷. If however, as no Christian doubts, the apostles of

⁶ Catalogues of the seventy disciples are extant, subjoined to the *Libri III. de Vita et Morte Moysis*, elucidated by Gilbert Gaulmin; and again published by J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, p. 474. [See an account of these catalogues in note³, p. 53 above. *Tr.*]

⁷ "Those who imagine that *Christ* himself, or the *apostles* by his direction and authority, appointed a certain fixed form of church government, are not agreed what that form was. The principal opinions that have been adopted upon this head, may be reduced to the four following. The first is, that of the *Roman Catholics*, who maintained that, *Christ's* intention and appointment was, that his followers should be collected into one sacred empire, subjected to the government of *St. Peter* and his successors, and divided, like the kingdoms of this world, into several provinces; that, in consequence thereof, *Peter* fixed the seat of ecclesiastical dominion at *Rome*, but afterwards, to alleviate the burthen of his office, divided the church into three greater provinces, according to the division of the world at that time, and appointed a person to preside in each, who was dignified with the title of *patriarch*; that the European patriarch resided at *Rome*, the Asiatic at *Antioch*, and the African at *Alexandria*; that the *bishops* of each province, among whom there were various ranks, were to reverence the authority of their respective patriarchs, and that both bishops and patriarchs were to be passively subject to the supreme dominion of the *Roman Pontiff*. See *Leo Allatius, de perpetuo Consensu ecclæs. Orient. et Occident.* lib. i. cap. ii.; and *Morin, Exercit. ecclæs. lib. i. exerc. i.* This

romantic account scarcely deserves a serious refutation. The second opinion concerning the government of the church, makes no mention of a supreme head, or of patriarchs constituted by divine authority; but it supposes that the apostles divided the Roman empire into as many ecclesiastical provinces as there were secular or civil ones; that the metropolitan bishop, i. e. the prelate who resided in the capital city of each province, presided over the clergy of that province, and that the other bishops were subject to his authority. This opinion has been adopted by some of the most learned of the Romish Church; (*Petrus de Marca De Concord. sacerdot. et imperii*, lib. vi. cap. i. *Morin, Exerc. ecclæs. lib. i. Exerc. xviii.*; and *Pagi, Critica in Annal. Baronii*, ad ann. 37. tom. i. p. 29.) and has also been favoured by some of the most eminent British divines; (*Hammond, Diss. de Episcop.*; *Beveridge, Cod. Canon. vet. ecclæs. cindio.* lib. ii. cap. v. tom. ii. *Patr. Apostol.* and *Ussher, de Origine episcop. et metropol.* p. 20.) Some Protestant writers of note have endeavoured to prove that it is not supported by sufficient evidence: (*Basnage, Hist. de l'Eglise*, tom. i. livr. i. cap. 8. *Boehmer, Annot. ad Petrum de Marca de Concordia sacerdot. et imperii*, p. 143.)—The third opinion is that of those who acknowledge that when the Christians began to multiply exceedingly, metropolitans, patriarchs, and archbishops were indeed created, but only by human appointment and authority; though they confess, at the same time, that it is consonant to the orders and intentions of *Christ* and his apostles, that there should be, in every Christian church one person invested with the highest

Jesus Christ acted by divine command and guidance, then that form of the first Christian bodies, which found its way to all other churches from the one organized at Jerusalem by the very men who had been intimate with Christ, must be taken for *divine*. From this, however, you will not make out that it is eternal and immutable. Now, each Christian association, in those primitive times, was composed of the *people*, the *presiding officers*, and the *assistants* or *deacons*⁸. These *must be* the component parts of every society. The highest authority was in the *people*, or the whole body of Christians; for even the apostles themselves inculcated by their example, that nothing of any moment was to be done, or determined on, but with the knowledge and consent of the brotherhood⁹. And this mode of proceeding, both prudence and necessity required, in those early times.

§ 6. The assembled people, therefore, elected their own presiding officers and teachers, or freely approved such as came recommended by others. They also either repudiated laws, proposed by the presiding officers at their meetings, or voted for making them binding: they both excluded and re-admitted wicked and unworthy members; they decided the controversies and disputes that arose; they heard and determined the causes of presbyters and deacons; in a word, they did every thing which marks the parties invested with *supreme power* in any state. All these rights the people paid for, by supplying the funds necessary for supporting the teachers, the deacons, and

authority, and clothed with certain rights and privileges, above the other doctors of that assembly. This opinion has been embraced by many English divines of the first rank in the learned world; and also by many in other countries and communions.—The *fourth* and last opinion is that of the *presbyterians*, who affirm that *Christ's* intention was, that the Christian doctors and ministers should all enjoy the same rank and authority, without any sort of pre-eminence or subordination, or any distinction of rights and privileges.—The reader will find an ample account of these *four* different opinions with respect to church government, in Dr. Mosheim's larger history of the first century.

"The truth of the matter is, that *Christ*, by leaving this matter *undetermined*, has, of consequence, left Christian societies a *discretionary power*, of model-

ling the government of the church in such a manner, as the circumstantial reasons, of times, places, &c. may require; and, therefore, the *wisest* government of the church, is the *best* and the *most divine*; and every Christian society has a *right* to make laws for itself, provided, that these laws are consistent with charity and peace, and with the fundamental doctrines and principles of Christianity." *Maccl.*—This, it must be recollected, is a Presbyterian view. *Ed.*]

⁸ Ex populo, ex presbiteris, et ex ministris, seu diaconis. *Mosh.* [Eusebius, (*Demonstratio Evang.* l. vii. c. 2.) omits the *deacons*, unless he includes them among the rulers; for he divides a church into ἡγουμένους, πρεσβυτέρους, and κληρικούς, the rulers, the faithful, and catechumens. *Schl.*]

⁹ Acts i. 15; vi. 3; xv. 4; xxi. 22.

the poor, for strengthening the common interest, and warding off unforeseen dangers. These funds consisted of voluntary contributions of every kind, brought by individuals, according to their abilities, to their public meetings, and usually called *oblations*.

§ 7. Among all members of the church, whatever might be their account or condition, there was the most perfect equality. This they manifested by their love-feasts, by calling each other *brethren* and *sisters*, and in other ways. Nor in this first age was there any distinction between the initiated and candidates for initiation. For whoever professed to regard *Jesus Christ* as the Saviour of the world, and to depend on him alone for salvation, was immediately baptized, and admitted into the church. But in the process of time, as Christianity extended, it was deemed advisable, if not necessary, to distribute the people into the two classes of *faithful* and *catechumens*. The former, being such as had been solemnly taken into the society by baptism, might be present at all the parts of religious worship, and enjoy the right of voting in meetings of the church. The latter, being yet unconsecrated by the lustral sacrament, were neither admitted to the common prayers, nor the sacred supper, nor to the meetings.

§ 8. The presiding officers of the church were denominated, sometimes *presbyters* or *elders*, a designation borrowed from the Jews, and indicative rather of the wisdom than the age of the persons; and sometimes, also, *bishops*; for it is most manifest, that *both terms* are promiscuously used in the New Testament for one class of persons¹. These were men of gravity, and distinguished for their reputation, influence, and sanctity². Some of them, it is commonly inferred from St. Paul's words³, *taught* the people, others rendered public services in some other way. If, however, this distinction between *teaching* and *ruling elders*, ever existed at all, which I neither affirm nor deny, it certainly does not seem to have been of long continuance, for

¹ Acts xx. 17, 28. Phil. i. 1. Tit. i. 5. 7. 1 Tim. iii. 1.

[Yet the N. T. contains a caution to Timothy against accusations of an "elder" (*presbyter*) unsupported by two or three witnesses, speaks of Titus as left in Crete to "set in order the things wanting, and ordain elders in every city," and mentions individual "angels"]

in connexion with the seven Asian churches. (1 Tim. v. 19. Tit. i. 5. Rev. i. 20.) The ancient and obvious explanations of these texts are, that Timothy was bishop of Ephesus, Titus of Crete, and that each of the Asian churches had its own bishop. *Ed.]*

² 1 Tim. iii. 1. Tit. i. 5.

³ 1 Tim. v. 17.

St. Paul requires of *all* presbyters or bishops, that they be *able to teach* and instruct others ⁴.

§ 9. As few among the first professors of Christianity were learned men, and fit for imbuing with a knowledge of heavenly things minds unprepared for it, God saw the necessity of raising up, in many churches, extraordinary teachers, to discourse; when the Christians met, on things pertaining to religion, and reason with the people in his own words. These are the persons who in the New Testament are called *prophets* ⁵. The functions of these men are limited too much, by those who make it to have been their sole business, to expound the Old Testament scriptures, and especially the prophetic books ⁶. Whoever professed to be such a herald of God was allowed publicly to address the people; but there were present among the hearers divinely constituted judges, who were at no loss to distinguish true prophets from false ones. The order of prophets ceased, when the necessity for them was past.

§ 10. That the church had its public servants or *deacons*, from its first foundation, he will not doubt who recollects that no society can be without such persons, but least of all bodies like the first ones formed among Christians. Those *young men*, accordingly, who carried out the corpses of *Ananias* and his wife, were, without question, the *deacons* of the church at Jerusalem, attendant upon the apostles, when it met, and awaiting their commands ⁷. These first deacons of that body were

⁴ 1 Tim. iii. 2.—See, concerning the word *presbyter*, Camp. Vitringa, *de Synagoga vetere*, lib. iii. p. i. cap. i. p. 609. and J. Bened. Carpzov. *Exercit. in epist. ad Hebræos*, ex Philone, p. 499. On the thing itself, or rather the persons designated by this title, see J. Fr. Buddeus, *Ecclesia Apostol.* cap. vi. p. 719, and Christoph. Matt. Pfaff, *de Originibus juris ecclæ.* p. 49.

⁵ Rom. xii. 6. 1 Cor. xii. 28; xiv. iii. 29. Ephes. iv. 21.

⁶ See Moshheim's *Diss. de illis, qui prophetice vocantur in N. T.* [in the 2nd vol. of his *Diss. ad Hist. Eccl. pertinentes*, p. 125, &c. also Witsius, *Miscell. Sacra*, tom. i. Koppe, *Eccles. III.* in *Epistolam ad Ephes.* and Schleusner, *Lexicon in N. Test.* art. *προφήτης*, no. 10. Tr.]

⁷ Acts v. 6. 10. Those who may be surprised, that I should consider the *young men*, who interred the bodies of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, to be the *deacons*

of the church at Jerusalem, are desired to consider, that the words *νεώτεροι* and *νεανίσκοι*, *young men*, are not always indicative of age; but often, both among the Greeks and Latins, indicate a *function* or office. For the same change is made in these words, as in the word *presbyter*, which every one knows, is indicative, sometimes of age, and sometimes merely of office. As, therefore, the word *presbyter* often denotes the rulers or head men of a society or association, without any regard to their age; so also the terms *young men* and the *younger* not unfrequently denote the servants, or those that stand in waiting; because ordinarily men in the vigour of life perform this office. Nor is this use of the word foreign from the New Testament. The Saviour himself seems to use the word *νεώτερος* in this sense, Luke xxii. 26, *ὁ μεῖζων ἐν ὑμῖν, γενέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος*. The word *μεῖζων*, he

chosen from Jews born in Palestine, and as they were thought by individuals of the nations who came from foreign parts, to show party-spirit in distributing benefits, the apostles caused seven other public servants, or deacons, to be appointed for that portion of the church at Jerusalem which consisted of Jews who had lived or were born abroad⁸. Six of these were complete foreigners, as their names bear witness; but *one* was taken from the *proselytes*, a class of persons that supplied many of the first Christians at Jerusalem, and hence could as fairly claim attention as Jews who had lived in other countries. The example of the church of Jerusalem being followed by all other Christian bodies, in obedience to the injunctions of the apostles, they likewise appointed *deacons*⁹. There were also, in many churches, and especially in those of Asia, female public servants, or *deaconesses*; who were matrons or widows of unquestionable character, that attended to the poor, and discharged other duties¹.

§ 11. In this manner Christians managed ecclesiastical affairs so long as their congregations were small, or not very numerous. Three or four presbyters, men of gravity and holiness, placed over those little societies, could easily proceed with harmony, and needed no head or president. But when, as

himself explains by ἡγούμενος, so that it is equivalent to ruler or presbyter: and instead of νεώτερος, he in the next clause uses ὁ διακονῶν, which places our interpretation beyond all controversy. So that μείζων and νεώτερος are not here indicative of certain ages, but of certain offices; and the precept of Christ amounts to this; "Let not him that performs the office of a presbyter or elder among you, think himself superior to the public servants or deacons."²—Still more evident, is the passage 1 Peter v. 5, ὡποῖος νεώτεροι ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις. It is manifest from what goes before, that *presbyter* here is indicative of rank or office, denoting teacher or ruler in the church: therefore its counterpart, νεώτερος, has the same import, and does not denote persons young in years, but the servants or deacons of the church. Peter, after solemnly exhorting the presbyters not to abuse the power committed to them, turns to the deacons and says, "And likewise ye younger, i. e. ye deacons, despise not the orders of the presbyters, but perform cheerfully whatever they require

of you."—In this same sense, the term is used by Luke, Acts v. 6. 10. where νεώτεροι or νεανίσκοι are the deacons of the church at Jerusalem, the very persons, whom, a little after, the Hellenists accused before the apostles of not distributing properly the contributions for the poor. I might confirm this sense of the term *young men*, by numerous citations from Greek and Latin writers, both sacred and profane; but this is not the place for such demonstrations.

⁸ Acts vi. 1.

⁹ 1 Tim. iii. 8, 9.

¹ For an account of the deacons and deaconesses of the ancient churches, see Casp. Ziegler, *de Diaconis et diaconissis*, Wittemb. 1678, 4to. Sam. Basnage, *Annales polit. eccles.* ad ann. 35, tom. i. p. 450. Joseph Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiast.* book ii. ch. 20. [and Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. ante Constant.* M. p. 118, &c. where he defends, at great length, his somewhat peculiar views, respecting the seven deacons of the church at Jerusalem.]

churches grew larger, there was an increased number not only of presbyters and inferior ministers, but also of labours and occupations varying in character, it became necessary that the council of presbyters should have a *president*, a man of distinguished gravity and prudence, who should distribute among his colleagues their several tasks, and be as it were the central point of the whole society. He was at first denominated *the angel*², but afterwards, *the bishop*; that word in Greek³ being indicative of his principal business. It would seem, that the church of *Jerusalem*, when grown very numerous, after the dispersion of the apostles among foreign nations, was the *first* to elect such a president; and that other churches, in process of time, followed the example⁴.

§ 12. Those, however, who judge of bishops in the first and golden age of Christianity from their successors in the following centuries, blend and confound characters that are very different. For in this century and the next, a bishop had charge of a *single* church, which might ordinarily be contained in a private house; nor was he its *lord*, but in reality its *minister* and servant; instructing the people, conducting all parts of public worship, and attending on the sick and necessitous in person. Undoubtedly, such things as he could not manage and perform he committed to the presbyters; but he had no power to decree or sanction any thing until it was approved by the presbyters and people⁵.

² Apoc. ii. iii.—[The title of *angel* occurs only in the Apocalypse, a highly poetic book. It was not, probably, the common title of the presiding presbyter; and certainly was not an *older* title than that of *bishop*, which is so often used by St. Paul in his epistles, which were written long before the Apocalypse. See Schlegel's note here.

³ Ἐπίσκοπος, an *Inspector*, or *Overseer*, with which the Latin *Episcopus* is identical, and from which the word expressive of that officer in all European languages, is derived. *Ed.*

⁴ [Dr. Mosheim, *de Rebb. Christ. ante C. M.* p. 134, has a long note, in which he argues from the traditional accounts of a longer catalogue of bishops in the church of Jerusalem than in any other church, during the first ages, that the church of Jerusalem must be supposed to have had bishops *earlier* than any other. *Tr.*]—The first in the series of bishops of Jerusalem is said by Eusebius to have been James, known as our Lord's brother, and surnamed the Just.

(*E. H.* l. ii. c. i.) Some have identified him with James, the son of Alphaeus, thus making him one of the twelve apostles: but Eusebius (i. 12.) places him among the seventy disciples. His importance in the church of Jerusalem appears to have been established at least as early as the third year after St. Paul's conversion. (*Gal.* i. 19.) Subsequently, Scripture makes him leader in the settlement of that question respecting Mosaic obligations, which occupied what is called the council of Jerusalem. (*Acts* xv. 13.) Unless ancient profane authority had been correct in designating him Bishop of Jerusalem, the scriptural accounts of his prominence there, are far from intelligible. *Ed.*

⁵ [All that is here stated, may be clearly proved from the records of the first centuries; and has been proved, by Jos. Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiast.* W. Beveridge, *Code Canon. primit. ecclesiæ*, and others. Mosheim, *de Rebb. Chr.* §c. p. 136.]

The emoluments of this singularly laborious and perilous office were very small. For the churches had no revenues, except the voluntary contributions of the people, or *oblations*; which, moderate as they doubtless were, were divided among bishop, presbyters, deacons, and poor.

§ 13. It was not long, however, before the extent of episcopal jurisdiction and power was enlarged. For the bishops who lived in cities, either themselves, or through their presbyters, gathered new churches in the neighbouring towns and country. As these churches continued under the protection and care of the bishops by whose ministry or procurement they received Christianity, ecclesiastical provinces were gradually formed, which the Greeks afterwards denominated *dioceses*. The persons to whom the city bishops committed the government and instruction of these village and rural churches, were called *chorepiscopi*⁶, that is, bishops of some country place or district. They were a sort of intermediate class between bishops and presbyters, being inferior to the former, superior to the latter⁷.

§ 14. All the churches of primitive time were *independent* bodies, no one of them owning subjection to any other. If they were, indeed, founded by an apostle, they had often the honour of being consulted in difficult and doubtful cases; yet they had no judicial authority, no control, no power of giving laws. On the contrary, it is clear as the noon-day, that all Christian churches had *equal rights*, and were in all respects on a footing of equality. Nor does there appear in this first age, any vestige of that *consociation* of churches in the same province, which gave rise to *councils* and *metropolitans*. Rather is it established, that, in the *second* century, a custom of holding councils took its rise in Greece, and thence extended into other provinces⁸.

⁶ Τῆς χώρας ἐπίσκοποι, *episcopi rurales*, seu *villani*. Murd.]

⁷ [Learned men, who have written largely on the subject, have debated whether the *chorepiscopi* ranked with bishops, or with presbyters. See J. Morin, *De sacris eccles. ordinatt.* pt. i. exere. iv. D. Blondel, *de Episc. et Presbyt.* sec. iii. W. Beverege, *Pandect. Canon.* tom. ii. p. 176. C. Ziegler, *de Episcopis*, l. i. c. 13, p. 105, &c. Peter de Marca, *de Concordia sacerdot. et imperii*, l. ii. cap. 13. 14. Boehmer, *Adnot. ad Petrum de Marca*, p. 62, 63. L. Thomassin, *Dis-*

ciplina eccles. vet. et nova, pt. i. l. ii. c. 1, p. 215.—But they did not belong entirely to either of those orders. Moshcim, *de Rebb. Christ. ante Const. M.* p. 137.

⁸ It is commonly said, that the meeting of the church in Jerusalem, which is described *Acts xv.* was the *first Christian council*. But this is a perversion of the import of the term *council*. For that meeting was a conference of only a single church, called together for deliberation: and if such meetings may be called *ecclesiastical councils*, a multitude of them were held in those primi-

§ 15. Among the Christian teachers whose writings rendered an additional service to the church, the first rank is clearly due to the *apostles*, and to certain of their disciples, whom God moved to place on record the deeds of *Christ* and his apostles. The writings of these men are collected into one volume, and are in the hands of all who profess to be Christians. For such matters as concern the history of these heavenly books⁹, and for arguments by which their divine authority and uncorrupted integrity are proved¹, those learned men are to be consulted who have written professedly on such subjects.

§ 16. As to the time *when* and the persons *by whom* the books of the New Testament were collected into one body, there are various opinions, or rather conjectures, of the learned; for the subject is attended with great and almost inexplicable difficulties to us of these latter times². It must suffice us to know, that before the middle of the *second* century, most of the books composing the New Testament were in every Christian church throughout the known world, and were read and regarded as the divine rule of faith and practice. And hence it may be concluded, that it was while some of the apostles were still living, or certainly while their disciples and immediate successors were everywhere to be met with, that these books were carefully distinguished from other things written by man³. That those *four* of them which are called *Gospels* were combined during the lifetime of *St. John*, and that the first three were approved by this holy personage, we learn from the testimony of *Eusebius*⁴. And why may we not suppose that the other books of the New Testament were collected into one body at the same time?

§ 17. Besides other causes requiring this to be done early, there was one that rendered it absolutely necessary, namely, a

tive times. An ecclesiastical council is a meeting of delegates from a number of confederate churches.

⁹ See on this subject, J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, l. iv. c. v. p. 122—227. [and Jer. Jones, *Method of settling the canonical authority of the N. T.*, 3 vols. 8vo, and the modern *Introductions to the books of the N. T.* in English, by G. Horne, and J. D. Michaelis, ed. Marsh; and in German, by Haenlin, Krug, Bertholdt, Eichhorn, &c. *Tr.*]

¹ The [early] writers in defence of the divine authority of the N. T. are

enumerated by J. A. Fabricius, *Delectus argumentorum et syllabus scriptor. pro verit. relig. Christianæ*, cap. 26. p. 502. [On the subject itself, the modern writers are numerous, and generally known. Lardner and Paley still hold the first rank among the English. *Tr.*]

² See Jo. Ens, *Biblioth. sacra, seu diatriba de libror. N. T. canone*, Amstel. 1710, 8vo, and Jo. Mills, *Prolegom. ad N. T.*, sec. i. p. 23, &c.

³ See Jo. Frick, *de Cura veteris ecclesiæ circa canon.* cap. iii. p. 86, &c.

⁴ Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iii. cap. 24.

variety of commentaries, filled with impositions and fables, on our Saviour's life and sentiments, composed soon after his ascent into heaven, by men who, without being bad, perhaps, were superstitious, simple, and piously deceitful. To these were afterwards added other writings falsely ascribed to the most holy apostles by fraudulent individuals⁵. These worth-

⁵ Such as remain of these spurious works have been carefully collected by J. A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus N. Test.*, 2 vols. 12mo, pp. 2006. Hanb. 2nd ed. 1719. Many learned remarks on them occur in *Is. de Beausobre, Histoire critique des dogmes de Maniché, liv. ii. p. 337, &c.* [For the information of those who have not access to these spurious books, the following remarks are introduced.—No one of all the books contained in the *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* of Fabricius, speaks disrespectfully of Christ, of his religion, his apostles and followers, or of the canonical books of the N. T. They were evidently composed with a design to subserve the cause of Christianity. They aim to supply deficiencies in the true Gospels and Acts, or to extend the history by means of oral traditions and supplementary accounts, professedly composed by apostles, or apostolic men. At least, this is true of those books which bear the title of *Gospels, Acts, and Epistles*. These were all designed, either *first*, to gratify the laudable curiosity of Christians, and subserve the cause of piety; or, *secondly*, to put to silence the enemies of Christianity, whether Jews or pagans, by demonstrating, from alleged facts and testimony, that Jesus was the Messiah, his doctrines divine, his apostles inspired, &c., or, *lastly*, to display the ingenuity of the writer, and to gratify the fancy by a harmless fiction. The only parts of this collection which do not seem to me to fall under one or the other of these classes, are such as by mistake have been ascribed to the apostles and evangelists; such as the Liturgies, Creed, and Canons, which go under their names. Of those which are *lost*, no judgment can be formed but by testimony. Perhaps, some of them were composed with hostile views towards the canonical scriptures.—The following account of the contents of the *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* may not be unacceptable or useless to many. On opening the first volume, we meet with, 1. "The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary," Latin,

in 10 sections, p. 19—38. — 2. "The Previous Gospel, (Protevangelium,) ascribed to James the Just, the brother of our Lord," Gr. and Lat. in 25 sections, p. 66—125. — 3. "The Gospel of the Infancy of Christ, ascribed to Thomas the Apostle," Gr. and Lat., in 7 sections, p. 156—167. — 4. "The Gospel of the Infancy, translated from the Arabic, by Henry Sikes," Lat., in 55 sections, p. 168—211. It is the aim of all these to supply deficiencies in the *beginning* of the true Gospels, by acquainting us more fully with the history of the virgin Mary, Joseph, Elisabeth, &c., and with the birth, infancy, and childhood of Christ.—Next follow, 5. "The Gospel of Nicodemus," or, as it is sometimes called, "The Acts of Pilate," relating to the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, Latin, in 27 sections, p. 238—298. — 6. Three "Epistles of Pilate to Tiberius the emperor," giving account of the condemnation, death, and resurrection of Christ; Latin, about 2 pages.—7. "The Epistle of Lentulus to the Roman senate," describing the person and manners of Christ; Latin, *one* page.—The three last (No. 5, 6, 7,) were intended to be valuable *appendages* to the true Gospels, and to contain irrefragable *proofs* that Jesus was the Messiah, and clothed with divine authority.—Then follow the writings ascribed to Christ himself; viz., his correspondence with Abgarus, king of Edessa; which is to be found in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 13, and in various modern works. These letters seem to have higher claims to authenticity than any other pieces in this collection; and yet few, if any, of the judicious will now admit them to be genuine.—Fabricius next gives a *catalogue* of about forty apocryphal Gospels, or of all the spurious Gospels of which the slightest notice can be found in antiquity. These are all, of course, now lost, or buried in the rubbish of old libraries; except the few which are contained in the previous list.—Vol. i. pt. ii., begins with "The apocryphal *Acts* of the Apostles, or the

less productions would have wrought great confusion, and would have rendered both the history and the religion of Christ uncertain, had not the rulers of churches taken care to separate without delay the books which were truly divine, and came from apostolic hands, from the mass of trash, and to form them into a volume by themselves.

§ 18. Next after the apostles, *Clement*, bishop of Rome, obtained very high reputation, as one of the writers of this century. The accounts that we have at this day of his life, actions, and death, are, for the most part, uncertain⁶. There are still

history of their conflicts; ascribed to Abdias, the first bishop of Babylonia," libr. x. Lat., p. 402—742. This history summarily recounts what the canonical books relate of each of the twelve apostles, and then follows them severally through their various travels and labours, till their death or martyrdom. It was probably compiled in the middle ages, (it is first mentioned by James, a bishop of Geneva, in the 13th century,) and by a monk, who was well acquainted with the ancient legendary tales, and who had good intentions; but who, nevertheless, was incompetent to distinguish what was true from what was false. Then follows a catalogue of all the ancient biographies of individual apostles and apostolic men, which Fabricius could hear of; in all, 36 in number. Many of these were professedly compiled several centuries after the apostles were dead, and all of them that still remain are mere legends, of little or no value. Most of those that have been published are to be met with in the *Martyrologies* and in the *Acta Sanctorum*. Fabricius next gives us apocryphal Epistles, ascribed to the virgin Mary, to Paul, and to Peter. Mary's letters are but three, and those very short. One is addressed to St. Ignatius, in 9 lines; another, to the people of Marseilles, in 11 lines; and the third, to the people of Florence, in 4 lines. To St. Paul is attributed a short Epistle to the Laodiceans, Gr. and Lat. It is a tolerable compilation from his genuine epistles. Then follows a gentlemanly but rapid correspondence, in Latin, said to have passed between St. Paul and Seneca, the Roman philosopher. It comprises 14 short letters, full of compliments and of very little else. Paul's third Epistle to the Corinthians, has not had the honour to be published. There is one

Epistle of the apostle Peter, addressed to the apostle James, still extant, in the *Clementina*, or spurious works of Clement Romanus. Of spurious Revelations, Fabricius enumerates twelve; most of which are either lost, or have not been judged worth publishing. The Shepherd of Hermas and the ivth book of Esdras are the two best known, and the most valuable. The iid vol. of the *Codex* opens with the ancient Liturgies, going under the names of the apostles and evangelists. They are *sic*; namely, those which bear the names of St. James, St. Peter, St. John, St. Matthew, and St. Luke; together with a short prayer ascribed to St. John. These Liturgies, doubtless, are quite ancient. We may believe them to have been actually used by different churches, which supposed they were in accordance with the instructions of their favourite apostles. To these Liturgies are subjoined nine Canons, or ecclesiastical laws, said to have been adopted in a council of the apostles held at Antioch; and finally, the Apostles' Creed, which many of the ancients supposed was formed by the apostles themselves. The Appendix to the *Codex* gleans up some fragments and additional notices of the pieces before mentioned, and then closes with the Shepherd of Hermas, accompanied with notes. *Tr.*

⁶ Subsequent to Tillemont, [*Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tome ii. pt. i. p. 279.] Cotelier, [*Patres Apostol.*] and Grabe, [*Spicileg. Patrum*, sac. i. p. 264, &c.] Philip Roudinimus has collected all that is known of this great man, in the first of his two books, *de St. Clemente, papa et martyre, ejusque Basilica in urbe Roma*, Rome, 1706, 4to. [See also Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i. p. 14—20, ed. 2nd. Clement was, perhaps, the person mentioned by

extant, *two epistles to the Corinthians*, bearing his name, written in Greek; of these, most people consider the second as falsely ascribed to the holy man by some deceiver⁷; the first is generally thought genuine. Yet even this bears marks of alterations by some ill-judging person, who could not bear that so great a man should have written with so little erudition and ability⁸.

Paul, *Philip*. iv. 3. He was one of the most distinguished Roman Christians, became bishop of Rome towards the close of the century, and is said to have lived till the third year of Trajan's reign, or about A.D. 100. *Tr.*]

⁷ The editions of Clement's epistles to the Corinthians are mentioned by J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, lib. iv. c. 5, p. 175, &c., to which must be added, the edition of Hen. Wotton, Cantab. 1718, 8vo, which is preferable to the preceding editions in many respects. [The English reader may find them both, together with some account of this author, in Abp. Wake's *Genuine epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, translated*, &c. An ample account of them is given by N. Lardner, *Credibility of the Gosp. history*, pt. ii. vol. i. p. 283, ed. Lond. 1815. *Tr.*] Neander says of Clement's two epistles, "The first was read in the first centuries aloud at divine service in many churches, even with the writings of the New Testament. It contains an exhortation to unity, interwoven with examples and general reflections, addressed to the church at Corinth, which was shaken by divisions. This letter, although on the whole genuine, is nevertheless not free from important interpolations; e. g. a contradiction is apparent, since throughout the whole epistle, we perceive the simple relations of the earliest forms of a Christian church, as the bishops and presbyters are always put upon an equality, and yet in one passage, (40, and following), the whole system of the Jewish priesthood is transferred to the Christian church. The second epistle, as it is called, is evidently only the fragment of a homily." Rose's *Neander*, Lond. 1841, ii. 332. *Ed.*]

⁸ See J. B. Cotellier, *Patres Apostolici*, tom. i. p. 133, 134, and Edw. Bernhard, *Adnotationes ad Clementem*, in the last edition of the *Patres Apostol.* by J. le Clere. These annotations H. Wotton has in vain attempted to confute, in his notes on the epistle of Clement.—[Be-

sides the two epistles to the Corinthians, there are extant, in Syriae, two other epistles, ascribed to Clement, entitled, *de Virginitate, seu ad Virgines*. They were first brought to Europe by Sir James Porter, British ambassador at Constantinople, and were published with a Latin translation accompanying the Syriae text, by J. J. Wetstein, at the end of the 2d vol. of his very learned *Gr. N. Testament*, Lugd. Bat. 1752. Dr. N. Lardner assailed their genuineness, in a *Diss.* of 60 pages, 8vo, Lond. 1753, and Herrn. Venema followed, in three printed letters, 1754. Wetstein replied to the former; but dying in March, 1754, he left the controversy with the latter, to Andrew Galand, who prosecuted it in his *Bibliotheca vet. Patrum*, Dissert. ii. cap. ii., also in Sprenger's *Thesaurus rei Pictæ*, tom. i. p. 60, &c. These epistles are not mentioned by any writer till near the end of the fourth century. They were probably composed, in the oriental church, at the close of the second, or in the third century; and for the double purpose of recommending celibacy and reprehending the abuses of such a life. *Tr.*] "The high antiquity of these epistles is in some degree testified by the non-appearance of any endeavour to support the pretensions of the hierarchical party; and by the circumstances, that the ideas of the priesthood belonging to the Old Testament are not here introduced into the Christian church, as is the case in similar writings of the kind; that neither the separation of the priesthood from the laity, nor the distinction of bishops and presbyters occurs here; and that the gift of healing the sick, and especially demoniacs, is considered as a free gift, and not as a gift belonging to one peculiar office. And yet this is no certain proof of the high antiquity of the epistles; because, even if it were of later origin, all this might be explained from the idiosyncrasy of certain regions of the East." Rose's *Neander*, ii. 332. *Ed.*]

§ 19. The other works which bear the name of *Clement*, namely, *the apostolic Canons*, *the apostolic Constitutions*, *the Recognitions of Clement*, and *the Clementina*⁹, were fraudulently ascribed to this eminent father by some deceiver, for the purpose of procuring them greater authority. This, all now concede. The *apostolic Canons* are *LXXXV ecclesiastical Laws*; and exhibit the principles of discipline received in the Greek and oriental churches, in the second and third centuries. The *VIII Books of apostolical Constitutions*, are the work of some austere and melancholy man, so bent upon that religious reformation among Christians which he thought required by their defection from primitive purity and sanctity, that he did not hesitate to recommend his precepts by the names of the apostles, for the sake of ensuring them a more ready approbation¹. The *Recognitions of Clement*, which differ but little from the *Clementina*, are pleasing fables, composed by an Alexandrine Jew, who was also a philosopher, in the *third* century, to meet in a new manner the attacks of Jews, Gnostics, and philosophers upon the Christian religion. A careful perusal of them will assist a person much in gaining a knowledge of the state of the ancient Christian church².

⁹ For the history and various editions of these works, see Thom. Ittig, *Diss. de Patribus Apostol.*, prefixed to his *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostol.* and his *Diss. de Pseudepigraphis Apostol.*, annexed to his *Appendix ad librum de Hæresiarchis ævi Apostol.*—Also J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, l. v. cap. i. p. 31, &c., and l. vi. cap. i. p. 4, &c. [The best edition is that of Cotelier, republished by Le Clerc, 2 vols. fol. Amstel. 1724. Tr.]

¹ The various opinions of the learned respecting the *Apostolic Canons and Constitutions*, are collected by J. F. Buddeus, *Isagoge in Theologian*, pt. ii. cap. v. p. 746. [See Bp. Beveridge, *Notes on these Canons*, and his *Codex Canonum eccles. prim. rindic. et illustratus*, Lond. 1673, 4to. The *Canons* themselves make a part of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, and are also inserted in Binusius' and other large collections of the Councils. They are valuable documents respecting the order and discipline of the church, about the *third* century. The *Apostolic Constitutions* seem to have undergone changes since their first formation, and probably by Arian hands in the *fourth* century.

They are voluminous and minute regulations, respecting ecclesiastical discipline and worship. They are of considerable use in determining various points of practice in the church, during the third, fourth, and fifth centuries. Tr.]

² See Mosheim's *Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia*, in the first vol. of his *Dissert. ad historiam eccl. pertinentes*, § 34, p. 174, &c. [The *Apostolic Canons and Constitutions* were ascribed to Clement as the collector and publisher only. The *Recognitions, Clementina*, &c., are ascribed to him as the author. The writings belonging to this latter class, are three different works on the same subject, and written after the same general plan. They all doubtless had one and the same author, who rewrote his own work, for the sake of giving it a better form. The substance of them all is Clement's history of his own dissatisfaction with paganism; his first and slight knowledge of Christianity, which induced him to journey from Rome to Palestine; there he met with Peter, and for some time resided and travelled with him, heard his public

§ 20. Among the *Apostolic Fathers*, as those writers are called, who conversed either with the apostles themselves, or with their immediate disciples, the next after *Clement* is *Ignatius*, bishop of Antioch, a disciple and companion of the apostles. He suffered martyrdom under *Trajan*; being exposed to wild beasts, in the theatre at Rome³. There are extant several epistles bearing his name; and concerning which the learned have had long and sharp contests. The *seven*, written while he was on his way to Rome, as published A. D. 1616, by *Is. Vossius*, from a Florentine MS., are accounted genuine; most writers reject the others as forged. To this opinion I cheerfully accede; and yet I must acknowledge that the genuineness of the *epistle to Polycarp*, on account of its difference in style, appears to me very dubious; and indeed the whole subject of the Ignatian epistles in general is involved in much obscurity and perplexity⁴.

discourses, and witnessed his combats, particularly with Simon Magus; and in private conversations with the apostles, every thing pertaining not only to Christianity, but to cosmogony, physics, pneumatology, &c., was fully explained to him. The *three* works often relate precisely the same things, and in the same words; but they not unfrequently differ in the fulness of their details, and in many of the minor points both of doctrine and of fact. The *first* is entitled *Sti Clementis Romani Recognitiones*. The original is lost; so that we have only the Latin translation of Rufinus. It is divided into 10 books, and fills 111 large folio pages. The *second* is the *Clementina* (τὰ Κλημεντῖνα), first published, Gr. and Lat., by Cotelier. It fills 146 folio pages. It commences with an epistle of Peter, and another of Clement, addressed to the apostle James. The body of the work, instead of being divided into books and chapters, like the *Recognitiones*, is thrown into 19 discourses, or homilies (ὁμιλίαι), as delivered by Peter, but committed to writing by Clement. The *third* is the *Clementine Epitome*, or abridged account of the acts, travels, and discourses of Peter, together with the epistle of Clement to James, Gr. and Lat., pp. 52, fol. This is, as its title implies, a mere abridgement of the two preceding works. *Tr.*

³ See Sch. de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. pt. ii. p. 42. 80.

⁴ In regard to these epistles, consult J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, lib. v. cap. i. p. 38—47. [Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 36, makes very honourable mention of Ignatius and his epistles; and describes his conduct while on his way to Rome, the place of his martyrdom. The account of his martyrdom, which is printed along with his epistles, gives a still fuller account of this eminent father. It is clear that he suffered death in the reign of Trajan; but whether A.D. 107, or 116, is uncertain. Rome was the place of his martyrdom, and wild beasts his executioners. On his way from Antioch, he was enraptured with his prospect of dying a martyr, and wrote probably all his epistles. Eusebius says: "He confirmed the churches in every city through which he passed, by discourses and exhortations; warning them most especially to take heed of the heresies which then first sprung up and increased." From Smyrna (according to Eusebius) he wrote *four* of his epistles; namely, to the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, and Rome. The last of these was to entreat the Roman Christians not to interpose and prevent his martyrdom. From Troas, he wrote *three* other epistles; namely, to the churches of Philadelphia and of Smyrna, and to his friend Polycarp. Of these *seven* epistles, there are duplicate copies still extant; that is, copies of a larger and of a smaller size. The latter are those which many suppose to be genuine. Besides these, there are extant *five* other

§ 21. *Polycarp*, bishop of Smyrna, suffered martyrdom at an extreme age, in the middle of the second century. The epistle addressed to the Philippians, which is ascribed to him, is by some accounted genuine, and by others spurious; which of these are in the right, it is difficult to determine⁵. The *Epistle of Barnabas*, as it is called, was, in my judgment, the production of some Jewish Christian who lived in this century, a man undoubtedly by no means bad, but possessed of little genius, and spoilt by Jewish fables. He was clearly a different person from *Barnabas*, the companion of *St. Paul*⁶. The *Shepherd of Hermas*, as it is called, because an *angel*, acting and apparelled like a *shepherd*, plays the first part in it, was composed in the second century by *Hermas*, the brother of *Pius*, the Roman bishop⁷. It seems to have been written by a man scarcely

Greek epistles, and as many more in Latin; which are now universally rejected: namely, *ad Mariam Cassibolitana*, *ad Tarsenses*, *ad Antiochenos*, *ad Heronem Antiochenum diaconem*, *ad Philippenses*; also one in Latin, from the Virgin Mary to Ignatius, and his reply; two from Ignatius to St. John; and one of Maria Cassibolitana to Ignatius. It is the singular fortune of the seven first epistles of Ignatius, to have become the subject of sectarian controversy among Protestants. In these epistles, the dignity and authority of bishops are exalted higher than in any other writings of this age. Hence, the strenuous advocates for the apostolic origin of episcopacy, prize and defend these epistles with no ordinary interest; while the reformed divines, and especially those of Holland, France, and Switzerland, assail them with equal ardour. The most prominent champions are Bishop Pearson, in his *Vindiciæ epistolarum Ignatii*, Cantab. 1672, 4to, and John Dailly, *de Scriptis quæ sub Dionysii Areop. et Ignatii Antioch. nominibus circumferuntur*, Geneva, 1666, 4to. But each of these is supported by a host of able polemics. The truth is, that the external evidence, or that from ancient testimony, makes much for the genuineness of these epistles, though equally for the larger as for the smaller. The internal evidence is divided, and of course affords ground for arguments on both sides. Moderate men of various sects, and especially Lutherans, are disposed to admit the genuineness of the epistles in their shorter form; but to regard them as interpolated

and altered. An English translation of them and of the martyrdom of Ignatius, may be seen in archbishop Wake's *Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers*. Tr.]

⁵ Concerning Polycarp and his epistle, see Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. pt. ii. p. 267, and J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr. lib. v. cap. i. p. 47*. [Also W. Cave, *Life of Polycarp*, in his *Apostolici*; or *Lives of the Primitive Fathers*, Lond. 1677, fol. The epistle of Polycarp, (the genuineness of which, if not certain, is highly probable,) and the epistle of the church of Smyrna, concerning the martyrdom of Polycarp, (which none now call in question,) are given in English, in archbishop Wake's *Genuine Epistles*, &c. Tr.]

⁶ Concerning *Barnabas*, see Tillemont, *Mémoires*, &c. tom. i. pt. iii. p. 1043. Thom. Ittig, *Select. histor. eccl. cap. i. § 14*, p. 20; and J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr. lib. iv. cap. v. § 14*, p. 173, and lib. v. cap. i. § 4, p. 3, and various others. [This ancient monument of the Christian church, is likewise translated by archbishop Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, &c. Tr.]

⁷ This is now manifest from the very ancient Fragment of a Treatise on the Canon of the Holy Scriptures, published a few years ago by Lud. Antony Muratori, (from an ancient MS. found at Milan,) in his *Antiq. Italicar. mediæ ævi*, tom. iii. diss. xliii. p. 853, &c. [But the genuineness and authority of this treatise itself are now very much questioned

sane, since he has thought himself at liberty to invent conversations between God and the angels, for the sake of giving precepts which he considered salutary, a more ready entrance into the minds of his readers. But celestial spirits with him talk greater nonsense than hedgers, and ditchers, or porters do among ourselves⁸.

§ 22. None of those who gave their minds to writing while the Christian state was yet in its infancy, were powerful from learning, genius, or eloquence; but in their simple and unpolished manner, they express elevated piety⁹. And this is honourable, rather than reproachful, to the Christian cause. For, that a large part of the human race should have been drawn over to the worship of our Saviour by men of slender attainments and abilities, proves that the propagation of Christianity must be ascribed not to human talents and appliances, but to the power of God.

by the learned; so that the true author of the *Shepherd of Hermas* is still unknown. *Tr.*]

⁸ [For the best edition of *Hermas*, we are indebted to J. A. Fabricius, who subjoined it to the third vol. of his *Codex Apocryph. N. T.* He also treats of this writer, in his *Biblioth. Græca*, l. v. cap. ix. § 9, p. 7. See also Thos. Ittig, *de Patribus Apostolicis*, § 55, p. 184, &c. [and in his *Select. histor. eccles. capita*, § 1, p. 65, 155—179. The *Shepherd of Hermas* is translated by archbishop Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, &c., and though wild and fanciful, yet from the pious spirit which it breathes, and the insight it gives us into the speculations of the early Christians, it is not a useless book. *Tr.*]

⁹ The writers above named, are denominated the *Apostolic Fathers*; and they are often published together. The best editions are by J. Bapt. Cotelier, Paris, 1672, re-edited by J. le Clerc: Antw. 1698, and again Amsterd. 1724, 2 vols. fol. with numerous notes by both the editors and others. [This last and best edition, Gr. and Lat., contains all that has been ascribed to the Apostolic

Fathers, whether truly or falsely. The portions which archbishop Wake regarded as genuine, he translated and published with a preliminary discourse of 136 pages, 2nd ed. Lond. 1710, 8vo. —The value of the genuine works of these fathers, is, to learned theology, very small; but as affording us acquaintance with the true spirit and sentiments and reasonings of Christians in the very first age after the apostles, they are of inestimable value.—If any one wishes to know what was the *simplicity and godly sincerity* of that first and infantile age of the church, let him read the Apostolic Fathers. *Tr.*]—"The remarkable difference between the writings of the apostles and those of the apostolic fathers, who are yet so close upon the former in point of time, is a remarkable phenomenon of its kind. While in other cases such a transition is usually quite gradual, in this case we find a sudden one. Here there is no gradual transition, but a sudden spring: a remark which is calculated to lead us to a recognition of the peculiar activity of the Divine Spirit in the souls of the apostles." *Rose's Neander*, ii. 329. *Ed.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES AND RELIGION.

§ 1. The nature and the standard of the Christian religion.—§ 2. Interpretation of the Scriptures.—§ 3. Mode of teaching Christianity.—§ 4. The Apostles' Creed.—§ 5. Distinction between catechumens and the faithful.—§ 6. Mode of instructing catechumens.—§ 7. Instruction of children ; schools and academics.—§ 8. Secret doctrine.—§ 9. Lives and characters of Christians.—§ 10. Excommunication.—§ 11. Controversies among Christians.—§ 12. Contest about the terms of salvation.—§ 13. Judaizing Christians.

§ 1. THE whole Christian religion is comprehended in two parts ; one of which teaches, *what is to be believed* upon divine subjects ; the other, *how we ought to live*. The apostles ordinarily call the former *the mystery*, or *the truth*, the latter *godliness*¹. The standard and rule of both are, those books which God dictated to certain individuals, chosen for the purpose, either before or after the birth of *Christ*. These books it has long been the custom to denominate *the Old* and *the New Testaments*.

§ 2. Provision, therefore, was early made, both by the apostles and their disciples, that these books should be in the hands of all Christians ; that they should be publicly read in their assemblies ; and be applied both to enlighten their minds with truth, and to advance them in piety. Those who expounded the Scriptures, studied simplicity and plainness. Yet it is not to be denied, that even in this century the perverse Jewish custom of obscuring the plain language of Scripture by forced and frigid allegories, and of diverting words from their natural and proper meanings, in order to extort from them some recondite sense, found admirers and imitators among Christians. Besides others, *Barnabas*, whose epistle is still extant, is proof of this.

¹ Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως, 1 Tim. iii. 9. Κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλία, vi. 3. Ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθεία τῆς κατ' εὐσέβειαν, Tit. i. 1.

§ 3. The manner of teaching religious truths was perfectly simple, and remote from all the rules of the philosophers, and all the precepts of human art. This is manifest, not only from the epistles of the apostles, but also from all the monuments of this century which have come down to us. Nor did any apostle or any one of their immediate disciples, collect and arrange the principal doctrines of Christianity in a scientific or regular *system*. The circumstances of the times did not require this; those who followed *Christ* had no other wish than to exhibit the religion that they had embraced by their turn of mind and way of life. They had no thought of recommending it by ingenious explanations and philosophic arrangements.

§ 4. There is indeed extant, a brief summary of Christian doctrines, which is called the *Apostles' Creed*; and which, from the fourth century onward, was attributed to our Saviour's ambassadors themselves. But at this day, all who have any knowledge of antiquity, confess unanimously, that this opinion is a mistake, and has no foundation². Those judge far more wisely and rationally, who think that this creed arose from small beginnings, and was gradually enlarged, as occasions required, in order to exclude new errors from the church³.

² See J. Fr. Buddeus, *Isayoge in Theologia*, l. ii. c. ii. § ii. p. 441, and J. G. Walch, *Introduct. in libros symbolicos*, l. i. cap. ii. p. 87, &c.

³ This is shown, with no less learning than ingenuity, by Peter King, *History of the Apostles' Creed*; which G. Olcarius translated into Latin, and published, Lips. 1704, 8vo. But those who read this book should be apprised, that the noble author [he was eventually baron of Ockham, and lord-chancellor. *Ed.*] often gives us conjectures instead of arguments; and that his conjectures do not always deserve to be implicitly received.—[Although the Apostles' Creed was not composed in a council of Apostles, as was supposed in the days of Rufinus, (*Ruf. de Symbolo*; subjoined to Cyprian's *Opera*), yet it appears to have been the general Creed of the Christian church, from, at least, the close of the second century, down to the Reformation. Nor did it undergo any very great or material change, as appears from comparing the formulæ of faith given by Irenæus, A. D. 175, (*adv. Hær.* i. 10, and iii. 4,) and by Tertullian, A. D. 192, (*de*

Virgin. veland. cap. i.—*contra Prævian*, cap. ii.—*Præscript. ad C. Hær.* cap. xiii.) with the forms of the Creed, in all subsequent writers, down to the present time. See these forms, collected by C. G. F. Walch, in his *Bibliotheca symbolica vetus*, Lemgo, 1770, 8vo. Yet there were some variations in its form, as used by different churches; and additions were made to it from time to time.—Besides serving as the general test of Christian orthodoxy, the principal use of this creed, in the third and following centuries, was to guide catechists in training and instructing the catechumens in the principles of Christianity. See Cyril of Jerusalem, (*Catechesis*, passim), Rufinus, (*de Symbolo*), and Augustine, (*Sermo I. ad Catecham.* Opp. tom. vi. p. 399—405, ed. Benedict.) It is a most valuable monument of the church, because it shows what in the early ages were considered as the great, the peculiar, and the essential doctrines of the gospel; viz. those all-important facts which are summarily recounted in this Creed. The common form of it in the fourth century, as used in most churches

§ 5. At the first promulgation of the gospel, *all* who professed firmly to believe that *Jesus* was the only Redeemer of mankind, and who promised to lead a holy life, conformably to

in Europe, Asia, and Africa, except some slight verbal discrepancies, was the following :

· Πιστεύω εἰς Θεόν (πατέρα) παντοκράτορα καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ (μονογεννητὸν), τὸν Κεῖνον ἡμῶν, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, τὸν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα, (καὶ) ταφέντα, (καὶ) τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἐκ (τῶν) νεκρῶν, ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς (καὶ) καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὅθεν ἔρχεται κρίναι (κρίνειν) ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· καὶ εἰς (τὸ) Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἀγίαν ἐκκλησίαν, ἄψιν ἁμαρτιῶν, σαρκοῦ ἀνάστασιν.

In Latin. Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem. Et in Christum Jesum, unicum filium ejus, Dominum nostrum; qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine; crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, et sepultus. Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; ascendit in caelos, sedet ad dextram Patris; inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Sanctum; sanctam ecclesiam; remissionem peccatorum; carnis resurrectionem.

In English. I believe in God, the Father almighty, and in Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, our Lord, who was born of the Virgin Mary by the Holy Ghost, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, buried, arose from the dead, on the third day ascended to the heavens, and sits on the right hand of the Father; whence he will come, to judge the living and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit; the holy church; the remission of sins; and the resurrection of the body.

A few centuries later, it attained in the Romish church its ampler form, in which it has since been adopted by most protestant churches: as follows,—“I believe in God the Father Almighty; Maker of heaven and earth: And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary, Suffered under Pontius Pilate, Was crucified, dead, and buried, He descended into hell; The third day he arose again from the dead, He ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; From thence he shall come

to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; The Holy Catholic Church; The Communion of Saints; The Forgiveness of sins; The Resurrection of the body, And the life everlasting. Amen.”

[Besides those mentioned by Mosheim, the principal writers on this Creed are Cyril, Rufinus, and Augustine, as above; and G. J. Vossius, (*de Tribus Symbolis*, Opp. tom. vi. p. 507, &c.) Abp. Ussier, (*de Rom. Eccles. antiq. Fidei Symbolis*), Bp. Pearson (on the *Credo*), C. Suicer, (*Thesaur. Eccles. voce Σύμβολον*), and J. Bingham, *Antiq. Recl. lib. x. Tr.*]

[The *Apostles' Creed* is really the baptismal profession of the Roman church. All churches were called apostolical in which an apostle had personally taught for any length of time, especially if he had died there. The Roman was the only western church which could securely challenge this distinction. Hence the name given to its peculiar symbol. This was considered as an actual production of the apostles as early as the fifth century; an opinion which Valla and Erasmus were among the first to suspect, and which is now wholly exploded. The creed, indeed, though of very high antiquity and authority, is, taken as a whole, inferior in both respects to the Nicene Creed. (Waterland, *Works*, Oxf. 1823, ii. 196, v. 392.) The late Dr. Burton attributed a still higher antiquity to the tradition that this creed was really framed by the apostles: “It is, perhaps, unnecessary to refute at any length the notion of what is called the Apostles' Creed being formed by each of the apostles contributing a sentence, or at least agreeing upon the whole. The idea is as old as the fourth century; and is not, therefore, to be treated as a modern superstition. Still, however, we could not admit the fact upon any principle of criticism or history; though there is positive evidence, that creeds were used in the second century; and though these creeds contain nearly all the clauses which are now found in the Apostles' Creed.” *Lectures upon the Ecclesiastical History of the First Century*, Oxf. 1831, p. 338. *Ed.*]

the religion that he taught, were received immediately among the disciples of *Christ*. A more full instruction in the principles of Christianity did not *precede baptism*, but followed it. But afterwards, when churches were every where established and organized, for very just reasons, this custom was changed; and none were admitted to the sacred font, unless previously well instructed in the primary truths of religion, and affording indubitable evidence of a sincere and holy character. Hence arose the distinction between *catechumens*, or such as were in a course of instruction and discipline under the care of certain persons, and the *faithful*, who were admitted to all the mysteries, having been initiated and consecrated by baptism ⁴.

§ 6. The instruction given to the catechumens was different, according to their genius and capacity. For those of feeble minds were instructed only in the more general and fundamental principles of religion: while those who appeared capable of comprehending all Christian knowledge, were instructed in every thing that could render a Christian stable and perfect according to the views of that age. The business of instructing those of superior capacity and genius was committed to men of gravity and erudition in the larger churches. Hence the ancient doctors generally divide their flocks into two classes of persons, the one comprising such as received solid and thorough instruction, the other embracing the more ignorant. Nor do they conceal the fact, that different modes of teaching were adopted in reference to these two classes ⁵.

§ 7. There is no doubt, but that the children of Christians were carefully trained up from their infancy, and were early put to reading the sacred books and learning the principles of religion. For this purpose, *schools* were erected everywhere, from the beginning. From these schools for children, we must distinguish those *seminaries* of the early Christians, erected extensively in the larger cities, at which adults, and especially such as aspired to be public teachers, were instructed and educated, in all branches of learning, both human and divine. Such seminaries, in which young men devoted to the sacred office, were taught whatever was necessary to qualify them

⁴ [See J. Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* lib. iii. cap. iv. and Tob. Pfanner, *de Catechuminis ceterum*, Vinarie, 1688, 12mo. Tr.]

⁵ [See Origen, *adv. Celsum*, lib. iii. p.

143. The apostles themselves seem to have been the authors of this practice, of which we have vestiges, 1 *Cor.* iii. 2. *Heb.* v. 12. *Schl.*]

properly for it, the apostles of *Christ* undoubtedly both set up themselves, and directed others to set up⁶. *St. John* at *Ephesus*, and *Polycarp* at *Smyna*, established such schools⁷. Among these seminaries, in subsequent times, none was more celebrated than that at *Alexandria*, which is commonly called a *catechetical school*, and was said to be erected by *St. Mark*⁸.

§ 8. What many tell us, that the earlier Christians had some sort of *secret discipline*⁹, that is, did not communicate to all the same instructions, may be admitted as true, if it be but rightly understood. Unquestionably those whom they would bring to *Christ*, were not introduced at once to the high mysteries of religion which exceed the grasp of the human mind, but were first only taught such doctrines as mere reason readily admits, till they were able to bear those that are more sublime and difficult. And afterwards, even individuals who now ranked among believers were not all instructed in the same manner; but one was directed to study and treasure up in his

⁶ 2 *Thim.* ii. 2.

⁷ *Irenæus*, *adv. Hæc.* i. ii. c. 22, p. 148, ed. Massuet. *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. c. 20.—[The proofs referred to here and in the text, are quite insufficient to evince, that in the first century, or even in the former part of the second, Christians established regular schools for their children, and academies for young men. Paul's direction to Timothy, (2 *Ep.* ii. 2.) "The things thou hast heard of me,—the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also;" seems to have no distinct reference to a regular public school, either for boys or for young men. And the passages in *Irenæus* and *Eusebius* referred to, speak only of the general instruction and advantages, which the neighbouring clergy and others derived from the apostle John; and of the interesting conversations of *Polycarp*. Considering the poverty and embarrassments of the first Christians, we can hardly suppose they could have erected such schools and academies. And from the great penury of writers, and of learned men of any sort, in the early church,—Justin Martyr, a converted philosopher in the middle of the second century, being the first learned writer after the apostles;—it seems most probable, that till past the middle of the second century, the means of education among Christians were very slender;

and by no means so general and so ample as Dr. Mosheim supposes. *Tr.*]

⁸ See J. A. Schmidt, *Diss. de schola catechet. Alexandr.* prefixed to the tract of A. Hyperius, *de Catechesi*; also Dom. Aulsius, *delle Scuole sacre*, lib. ii. c. i. ii. p. 5—17, and c. xxi. p. 92, &c. Concerning the larger schools of Christians in the East, at Edessa, Nisibis, Seleucia; and concerning the ancient Christian schools in general; see J. S. Asseman, *Biblioth. orient.* (Vat. tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 914—919.—[The ancient tradition, preserved by Jerome, (*de Scriptor. Illustr.* cap. 36,) that St. Mark was the founder of the catechetical school at Alexandria, deserves but little credit; since all antiquity is silent respecting a Christian school there, or any teacher or student in it, till the days of Pantaenus, and his pupil Clement Alex. near the close of the second century. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. iii. p. 186, &c. *Tr.*]

⁹ *Disciplina quædam arcani.* [The author evidently meant his readers to observe, that there is no occasion for admitting an identity between the secret instructions of the first century, and such as arose out of them at a subsequent period. Justin Martyr is thought to allude to a species of *Disciplina arcani*, but it does not appear with any clearness, before Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria. *Ed.*]

mind more, or fewer things, than another. Whoever would understand more than this, by the *secret discipline* of the first century, should beware, lest he confound the faults of subsequent ages with the excellences of this¹.

§ 9. Most authors represent the lives and morals of Christians in this age, as patterns of purity and holiness, worthy of the imitation of all subsequent ages. This representation, if it be understood of the *greater part* of the professed Christians, and not of *all*, is undoubtedly true. But whoever supposes the primitive churches to have been perfectly free from vices and sins, and estimates the lives of *all* the Christians by the conduct of some among them, and by the precepts and exhortations of their teachers, as is generally done by writers of books and tracts on the innocence and holiness of the early Christians, may be confuted by the clearest evidence of both testimony and facts².

§ 10. External sanctity was carefully guarded in the Christian commonwealth, by a regulation which deprived of religious ordinances, and expelled from the community, such as were

¹ Concerning this *secret doctrine*, much is collected by Chr. Matt. Pfaff, *Diss. posterior de prejudiciis theolog.* § 13, p. 149, &c. in his *Primitia Tubingensia*. [There is much valuable matter on the *Disciplina Arcani*, in the second century, to be found in Mosheim, *de Rebb. ante C. M.* 303. The English reader may consult advantageously on this curious subject, Mr. Faber's *Difficulties of Romanism*, p. 95. Romanists have naturally availed themselves of this peculiarity in the early Christian system to account for the want of ancient testimonies in favour of transubstantiation. But Mr. Faber has shown from Cyril of Jerusalem, that the Trinity was the chief object in this secret discipline. There were, however, other objects, and the sacraments among them: some of them, as the approaching fall of the Roman power, demanded concealment on political grounds. But whatever might be the origin of this discipline, its eventual importance undoubtedly arose, from a wish to naturalise among Christians something analogous to the mysteries about which their Pagan neighbours talked so much. *Ed.*]

² [For a knowledge of the state of piety and morals among the Christians

of the first century, we are dependent nearly altogether on the Holy Scriptures: for all the apostolic fathers, except Clement, lived and wrote in the second century. Besides, their writings state very few facts, and acquaint us with almost nothing, except what relates to the views and feelings of the writers themselves. Clement wrote upon occasion of a broil in the church of Corinth; and he aims to set home Paul's exhortations to them on former occasions. From the N. T., and especially from Paul's epistles, we learn many things respecting the state of morals and piety among Christians, from the first planting of the churches till about A.D. 68. And from the Apocryphical epistles, we learn the state of religion in the seven churches of Asia, about A.D. 96. Judging from these representations, it would seem that the characters of the Christians of that age presented a singular combination of excellences and defects; that, in some respects, they were indeed patterns for all after-ages; but, in other respects, and especially certain churches, as Corinth, Galatia, Sardis, and Laodicea, by no means deserved imitation. *Tr.*]

discreditable and polluted by the grosser vices, if, on admonition, they would not return to better courses. For this, authority was unquestionably given by Christ's apostles, at the very beginning of his kingdom³. It was a regulation, in enforcing which all took a share; the teachers and rulers generally pointing out individuals deemed unworthy of sacred rites, but the people freely either approved or repudiated their judgment. Excluded sinners, although they had committed even the greatest offences, if they gave satisfactory evidence of true repentance for their faults, and of an entrance upon a better course of life, were allowed to return to the church, at least in most places; yet but once only. For if such as had been restored went back again to their former sinful habits, and were thrust from the brotherhood once more, they lost all prospect of forgiveness⁴.

§ 11. As the Christian churches were composed of both Jews and Gentiles, between whom there had been an inveterate aversion, and as the new converts brought no small number of erroneous opinions imbibed in their tender years, it could not be but that various disagreements and contests would early arise among them. The first of these controversies related to the necessity of observing the law of *Moses*. It broke out in the church of Antioch; and its issue is stated by Luke⁵. This dispute was followed by many others; at one time with Jews, fond above measure of their ancestral religion; at another, with such as admired a fanatical kind of philosophy; at another, with some who abused the Christian doctrines, which they ill understood, to the gratification of their vices and appetites⁶. *St. Paul* and the other apostles often mention these controversies, but so cursorily and concisely, that we can hardly ascertain the exact points controverted.

³ [See 1 Cor. v.] For the discussions that have taken place respecting this law, see Chr. Matt. Pfaff, *de Originibus juris ecclesiast.* p. 10—13, 71, 78.

⁴ See Jo. Morin, *Commentar. de disciplina pœnitentiae*, lib. ix. cap. 19, p. 670, and others. [Natal. Alexander, *Hist. Eccles. N. T. sæc. iii. diss. vii.*; and J. Aug. Orsi, *Diss. qua ostenditur, cathol. ecclesiam tribus prior. sæculis capital. crim. reis pacem et absolut. neutiquam denegasse*; Milan, 1730, 4to. But all these writers describe rather the prac-

tice of the second and third centuries than that of the first. *Tr.*]

⁵ Acts xv.

⁶ Conduive to the illustrations of these controversies are the investigations of Herm. Witsius, *Miscellanea sacra*, tom. ii. exerc. xx. xxi. xxii. p. 668, &c. Camp. Vitringa, *Obscurett. Sacra*, lib. iv. c. ix. x. xi. p. 952. [J. F. Buddeus, *Ecclēsia Apostolica*; and especially Ch. W. Fr. Walch, *Vollständige Historie der Ketzereien, Spaltungen, u. s. v. vol. i. p. 68, &c.*; also the Commentators on the Scriptures. *Tr.*]

§ 12. Of all these contests, the greatest and most important seems to have been that upon the means of attaining to justification and salvation, which Jewish teachers excited at Rome and in other Christian churches. For while the apostles every where inculcated, that every hope of obtaining justification and salvation must be placed solely in *Jesus Christ* and his merits; these Jewish teachers ascribed to the law and to the works which it enjoined, the chief influence in procuring everlasting happiness. This error not only led on to many others, which were prejudicial to the religion of *Christ*, but also it was connected with the highest dishonour to the Saviour. For they who maintained that a life regulated according to the law, would give a title to eternal rewards, could not consider *Christ* as the true Son of God, and the Saviour of mankind; but merely as a prophet, or a divine messenger among men. It cannot therefore appear at all strange, that St. Paul, in his *Epistle to the Romans* and elsewhere, took so much pains to extirpate this capital error.

§ 13. The controversy respecting the necessity of the Mosaic rites in order to salvation, was wisely decided by the apostles⁷. But great as the apostolic influence was, that inbred love of the law which Moses enacted, and their fathers handed down, could not be wholly eradicated from the minds of the Jewish Christians, and especially of those who lived in Palestine. It diminished a little after Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans, and the temple ruined; yet it did not wholly subside. Hence it was, as we shall see hereafter, that a part of the Jewish Christians separated from the other brethren, and formed a distinct sect from adherents to the Mosaic law.

⁷ Acts xv.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RITES AND CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Baptism and the Lord's Supper appointed by Christ.—§ 2. Rites instituted by the apostles.—§ 3. The Jewish rites retained.—§ 4. Public assemblies of Christians, and times for meeting.—§ 5. Places of meeting.—§ 6. Mode of worship.—§ 7. Lord's Supper and *agape*.—§ 8. Baptism.—§ 9. Anointing the sick.—§ 10. Fasting.

§ 1. ALTHOUGH the Christian religion has the greatest simplicity, and requires nothing but faith and love; yet it could not wholly dispense with external rites and institutions. Jesus himself established only *two* ceremonies, which it is not lawful either to change or to abrogate; namely, *baptism* and the *holy supper*. He did not, however, mean them as naked forms, or to be merely significant, but also to have the power of changing men's minds. From his pleasure to establish no more, we should infer, that ceremonies are not essential to his religion, and that this business has been committed by him to the discretion and free choice of Christians.

§ 2. Many considerations leave us no reason to doubt, that the friends and apostles of the Saviour sanctioned in various places the use of other rites; which they either tolerated from necessity, or recommended for good and solid reasons. Yet we are not to suppose that they any where laid down some system of pontifical jurisprudence to be always ready, and never-ending; or that the same institutions were prescribed to all Christian societies. On the contrary, various things go to show, that Christian worship was from the beginning regulated and conducted differently in different places; unquestionably under authority of the apostles, their friends, and disciples; and that in this matter, much regard was paid to the ancient opinions, customs, and laws of the several nations¹.

¹ [It appears that even so late as the third and fourth centuries, there was considerable difference in the mode of

conducting religious worship among Christians. See Irenæus, quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. v. cap. 24.

§ 3. I am therefore induced to dissent from those who think that the Jewish rites and forms were *every where* transferred by the apostles and their disciples to the Christian assemblies. In those churches, indeed, which were composed either wholly or principally of Jews, I can easily believe the Jewish rites to have been so far retained as the different characters of the two religions would permit. And this may be evinced by a good many examples. But that the same took place in other churches, in which either no Jews, or only a few were found, is not merely uncertain, but also incredible. Different religious regulations were, in fact, necessary for those early times, in order to suit the peculiarities of genius and character in different nations.

§ 4. Since the discipline of Christians was various, it is very difficult to form such notions upon the form of their public worship, with others of their customs and institutions, as will be equally applicable to *all* the countries in which Christianity flourished. Yet there are a few regulations which may be considered as common to all Christians; and of these we shall give a brief account.—The Christians in this century assembled for the worship of God, and for their advancement in piety, on the *first day of the week*, the day on which *Christ* re-assumed his life: for that this day was set apart for religious worship by the apostles themselves, and that after the example of the church of Jerusalem, it was generally observed, we have unexception-

Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vii. cap. 19. Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. v. cap. 22. Augustine, *Epist.* 54, *Opp.* tom. ii. p. 93. A part of this difference in rites and ceremonies appears to have come down from the apostolic times. For when a contest arose in the second century, between the oriental and the occidental Christians, respecting the day on which Easter should be observed, we are informed by Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccl.* l. v. cap. 23, 24,) that the former maintained, that John was the author of their custom; and the latter, that Peter and Paul were the authors of theirs. Both churches were probably correct: for it is very probable that John, for certain reasons, did ordain in Asia, that the feast of Easter should be kept at the time the Jews kept it; and that Peter and Paul ordered otherwise at Rome. Further, the Greek and Latin churches had a contest on the question, whether

leavened or unleavened bread should be used in the sacred supper. And both churches claimed to have their customs handed down to them from the apostles; and for the reasons before mentioned, both were probably in the right.—Even the Catholics often admit this diversity of ceremonies in the apostolic church; e. g. Jo. Bona, *Rerum Liturg.* l. i. c. 7, § 2. *Opp.* p. 208; and the Jesuit, Jo. Harduin, makes no scruple to assert, that Paul enjoined on the Greeks *one* form for the consecration of priests; and Peter, on the Romans, another. His book is entitled, *La dissertation du P. le Courayer sur la succession des Presques Anglois et sur la validité de leur ordination, réfutée*, tom. ii. p. 13. Paris, 1725, 8vo. [Add A. Krazer, *de Apostolicis, nec non antiquis eccl. occident. Liturgiis*, sect. i. cap. i. § 2, p. 3, ed. Augustæ Vind. 1786. See Mosheim's *Institut. majores hist. Christ.* p. 375. *Schl.*]

able testimony². Moreover, those congregations, which either lived among Jews, or were composed in a great measure of Jews, were accustomed also to observe the *seventh day* of the week as a sacred day³: for doing which, the other Christians taxed them with no wrong. As to *annual* religious days, they appear to have observed *two*; the one in memory of *Christ's* resurrection; the other in commemoration of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles⁴. To these may be added those days on which holy men met death for *Christ's* sake; which, it is most probable, were sacred and solemn days from the very commencement of the Christian church⁵.

§ 5. The *places* of assembling were, undoubtedly, the private houses of Christians. But as necessity required, when a congregation was formed and duly regulated, that some fixed, uniform place should be designated for its meetings, and as some furniture was requisite for holding them, such as books, tables, and benches, which could not conveniently be transported from one situation to another, especially in those times, undoubtedly the consequence was, that these places soon became, instead of private rooms, in a manner, public ones⁶. These few remarks, I conceive, are sufficient to determine that long controversy,

² Ph. J. Hartmann, *de Rebus gestis Christianor. sub Apostolis*, cap. xv. p. 387. J. Hen. Böhrner, *Diss. l. juris eccles. antiqui de stato die Christianor.* p. 20, &c. [See also Acts xx. 7; ii. 1. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. Apoc. i. 10. Pliny, *Epist.* lib. x. ep. 97, n. 7. *Schl.*]

³ Steph. Curellæus, *Diatriba de esu sanguinis*; Opp. Theol. p. 958. Gabr. Albaspinicus, *Observatt. Eccles.* lib. i. obs. xiii. p. 53. In vain, some learned men labour to persuade us, that in *all* the early churches, *both* days, or the *first* and *last* days of the week, were held sacred. The churches of Bithynia, mentioned by Pliny, devoted but *one* stated day to their public worship: and beyond all controversy, that was what we call the *Lord's day*, or the first day of the week.

⁴ Although some have doubted whether the day called *Pentecost* (*Whit-Sunday*) was a sacred day, so early as the first century, (see J. Bingham, *Origines Eccles.* lib. xx. cap. 6.) yet I am induced, by very weighty reasons, to believe, that from the beginning it was held equally sacred with the *Passover*

(or *Easter day*). Perhaps also *Friday*, as the day on which our Saviour died, was, from the earliest times, regarded with more respect than other days of the week. See J. Godefroi, in *Codicem Theodos.* tom. i. p. 138. Asseman, *Biblioth. orient. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 217, 237. Martene, *Thesaur. Anecdotor.* tom. v. p. 66.

⁵ [These were called *Natalitia martyrum* (the *martyrs' birth-days*). See Casp. Sagittarius, *de Natalitiis martyrum*, republished by Cronius, Syntagma i. *Diss. philol.* 1699. In the second century, these *natalitia* were every where observed; and they are often mentioned by Tertullian and Cyprian. Nay, in the epistle of the church of Smyrna to Philomelius, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 15, the observance of the day of Polycarp's martyrdom is spoken of. *Schl.*]

⁶ See Camp. Vitringa, *de Synagoga vetera*, l. i. pt. iii. cap. 1, p. 432. [It may be inferred from Acts xix. 8, 1 Cor. xi. 22, xiv. 35, and Ja. ii. 2, that Christians then had certain determinate places for holding public worship. *Schl.*]

whether the early Christians had temples or not? If the word *temple* may denote a dwelling-house, or even a part of one, devoted to the public exercises of religion, yet neither with any idea of holiness attached to it, nor separated from every profane use, then I can readily admit that the earliest Christians had temples.

§ 6. In these public assemblies of Christians, the Holy Scriptures were read, which, for that purpose, were divided into certain portions. Then followed an exhortation to the people, neither eloquent nor long, but full of warmth and love. If any declared themselves under the Spirit's influence, they were allowed successively to state what the Lord commanded; the other *prophets* who were present judging how much authority was due to them⁷. Afterwards, the prayers which constituted no inconsiderable part of public worship, were repeated after the bishop⁸. To these succeeded hymns, which were sung,

⁷ See Dav. Blondell, *de Episcopis et Presbyt.* sect. iii. p. 216, 243, 246; Just. Hen. Böhmer, Diss. ii. *Juris eccles. antiq. de antelucanis Christianorum coetibus*, § iv. p. 39; Jos. Bingham, *Origines Eccles.* lib. viii. ch. i. and others.

⁸ 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

⁹ See Justin Martyr, *Apologia secunda*, p. 96, &c. Bp. Kaye thus gives Justin's account: "And on the day called Sunday," (τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρα.) "there is an assembling together of all who dwell in the cities and country; and the memoirs of the apostles, and the writings of the prophets, are read as long as circumstances permit. Then, when the reader has ceased, the president" (ὁ προϊστάς) "delivers a discourse, in which he admonishes and exhorts (all present) to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray," (εὐχὰς πέμπομεν) "and as we before said," (in describing the service after a baptism,) "prayer being ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president" (ὁ προϊστάς) "offers prayers in like manner, and thanksgivings according to his ability," (εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπτει.) "and the people express their assent by saying *Amen*; and the distribution of that over which the thanksgiving has been pronounced, takes place to each; and each partakes, and a portion is sent to the absent by the deacons. And they who are wealthy, and choose, give as much

as they respectively deem fit; and whatever is collected" (τὸ συλλεγόμενον) "is deposited with the president, who succours the orphans and widows, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us; and, in a word, takes care of all who are most in need." (Some account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr, Camb. 1829, p. 89.)—This very interesting statement really relates to the former half of the second century; but Mosheim is probably right in considering it applicable to the first also. The term *προϊστάς*, Bingham considers identical with *bishop*, which appears to be the fact (*Antiq.* II. ii. 9.); but Justin so uses it, in his account of the service after a baptism, (p. 96, ed. Thirlby,) as to furnish, perhaps, with a handle, such as would make the *president* not differ in order from the rest of the congregation. In describing the service after a baptism, he says, "Bread is then brought to that brother who presides, and a cup of wine, mixed with water." (Bp. Kaye's transl.) *προσφέρεται τῷ προϊστάτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κραμάτων*. It might, perhaps, be rendered, *to him who presides over the brethren*, which would suggest no suspicion of identity in order with the congregation generally. But whatever might be the president's general relation to the rest of the brethren, it is clear that from him proceeded the prayers and thanksgivings which converted, according to Justin,

not by the whole assembly, but by certain persons, during the celebration of the sacred supper and the feasts of charity. The precise order and manner of performing all these parts of religious worship in the various Christian churches, cannot be fully ascertained; yet it is most probable that no one of them was wholly omitted in any church¹.

§ 7. The prayers of Christians were followed by *oblations* of bread, wine, and other things, from which provision was made both for the ministers of the church and the poor. Now every Christian who had any thing to spare, brought his present, and offered it in a sense to the Lord². From these gifts, so much bread and wine as were requisite for the Lord's supper were set apart, and consecrated by certain prayers, which the bishop alone poured forth, the people responding *Amen*³. The distributors of the sacred supper were the *deacons*. To this most holy ordinance were annexed the sober meals, which, from the object of their institution, were called *agapæ*⁴. The various difficulties which occur in accounts of these feasts will undoubtedly embarrass none who bear in mind that the earliest Christians were governed by different rules, and did not manage every where alike either these, or any other of their institutions.

§ 8. In this century *baptism* was administered, in convenient places, without the public assemblies; and by immersing the candidates wholly in water⁵. At first, all who were engaged in

the bread and wine, from common bread and drink, into the body and blood of Christ. He also preached, after the lessons had been read, and acted as the congregation's almoner. But it does not appear that the bread and wine were taken, as they were subsequently, from the offerings then made by the congregation, or that any thing was given until the service was over. A collection, therefore, not an offertory, seems to have been the primitive practice. The collection, too, appears to have been wholly for the poor. It may be also worth observing, that nothing is said of any particular class or person to read the introductory lessons, or to conduct the prayers before the Eucharist. *Ed.*

¹ This must be understood of the churches that were fully established and regulated. For in the nascent churches, which had not become duly

regulated, I can believe one or other of these exercises might be omitted.

² See Christ. Matt. Pfaff, *Dissert. de oblatione et consecratione Eucharistica*; in his *Synagma Dissert. Theolog.* Stutgard, 1720, 8vo.

³ Justin Martyr, *Apologia secunda*, p. 98, &c. The writers on the ceremonies of the sacred supper are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibliograph. Antiquaria*, cap. xi. p. 395, &c.

⁴ Feasts of charity. The writers concerning the *agapæ*, are mentioned by Tho. Ittig, *Select. histor. eccles. capita*, sæcul. ii. cap. iii. p. 186, &c.; and Christ. Matt. Pfaff, *de Originibus juris eccles.* p. 68.

⁵ See Ger. Jo. Vossius, *de Baptismo*, disp. i. Thes. vi. p. 31, &c. and the authors recommended by J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliogr. Antiquar.* cap. xi. § xxv. p. 389, &c.

propagating Christianity, administered this rite: nor can it be called in question, that whoever persuaded any person to embrace Christianity, could baptize his own disciple. But when Christian bodies became settled, and were provided with fixed regulations, the *bishop* alone exercised the right of bathing new converts in the sacred font. But as the limits of his church embraced greater numbers and a wider district, he imparted this right to the *presbyters* and *chorepiscopi*; reserving, however, to himself the *confirmation* of baptism administered by a presbyter⁶. As to ceremonies, added to baptism, at this period, for the sake of order and decency, we have no means of saying any thing certain and solid. And we do not think it safe to lay down rules for the first age from the customs of subsequent times.

§ 9. The Greeks, when labouring under illness, sent for the rulers of the church⁷, according to the apostolic precept⁸, who, after the sick man had confessed his sins, commended his case to God in devout supplication, and anointed him with oil. Many things in regard to this rite may be, and have actually been, subjects of controversy. But the silence of the ancient writers prevents us from coming to any certain conclusions. It is, in fact, a matter seldom mentioned in monuments of early times, although its universal prevalence can be no wise doubted⁹.

§ 10. No law was enacted by *Christ* and his apostles concerning *fasts*; but it became the custom with most Christians as individuals, to join occasionally abstinence from food with their prayers, especially when engaged in an undertaking of more than usual importance¹. The length of time to be bestowed upon this duty was a matter left to the parties themselves: nor did a person expose his character at all, if he thought it sufficient for *him* to observe only the rules of strict tempe-

⁶ These remarks, I conceive, go to elucidate and determine the questions so strenuously debated among the learned, concerning the *right of administering baptism*. See Just. Hen. Böhmér, diss. xi. *Juris eccles. antiqui*, p. 500, &c. Jo. Le Clerc, *Biblioth. universelle et historique*, tome iv. p. 93, &c.

⁷ *Prefecti ecclesie*.

⁸ James v. 14.

⁹ Most of the ancient testimonies concerning this custom, are collected

by Jo. Launoi, *de Sacramento unctionis infirmorum*, cap. i. p. 444, Opp. tom. i. Among these passages, very few are to be found in the writers of the first centuries; yet there is here and there one which has escaped the notice of this very learned man. [The principal writers on this subject are mentioned by J. C. Wolf, *Cura philol. et crit.* tom. iv. on Ja. v. 14. *Tr.*]

¹ I Cor. vii. 5.

rance². Of any solemn *public* fasts, except only on the anniversary day of *Christ's* crucifixion, there is no mention in the most ancient times. Gradually, however, stated days of fasting were introduced; first by custom, afterwards by legal sanction. Whether any thing of this nature occurred in the *first* century, and what days were devoted to fasting, we have not the means of deciding. And yet I would not deny, that powerful arguments are adduced by those who think, that while the apostles were still living, or soon after their decease, the Christians in most places abstained from food, either wholly or partially, on the fourth and sixth days of the week³.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS SEPARATIONS OR HERESIES.

§ 1. Sects sprung up in the very time of the apostles.—§ 2. They gradually increased.—§ 3. Sect of the Gnostics.—§ 4. It originated from the oriental philosophy.—§ 5. They occasioned various errors in regard to the holy Scriptures, and other subjects.—§ 6. Gnostic opinions concerning *Christ*.—§ 7. Their moral doctrines.—§ 8. How they supported their doctrines.—§ 9. Causes of disagreement among themselves.—§ 10. Dositheus.—§ 11. Simon Magus was not a *heretic*.—§ 12. His history.—§ 13. His doctrines.—§ 14. Menander.—§ 15. Whether there was a sect of Nicolaitans.—§ 16. Cerinthus and the Cerinthians.—§ 17. Nazarenes and Ebionites properly belong to the 2nd century.

§ 1. CHRISTIAN societies were scarcely formed, and in a manner organized, when at once there were men every where, who, little contented with the simplicity and purity of that religion which the apostles taught, attempted innovations, and of their own heads wanted to fashion a religion for themselves. This appears from various passages in the epistles left us by the apostles, and particularly from *Paul's*. For in these there is frequent mention of persons, who either endeavoured to mould the Christian doctrines into conformity with that philosophy,

² Shepherd of Hermas, lib. iii. similit. v. p. 931. 935, ed. Fabricii, at the close of vol. iii. of his *Codex Apocryph. N. T.* [The best writer on this subject is John Daillé, *de Jeuniis et Quadragesima*, Du-

vent. 1654, 8vo, against whom, however, Beveridge brings some objections, in *Codex Canon. vind. Schl.*]

³ See Will. Beveridge, *Codex Canon. vindic.* tom. ii. *Patr. Apostol.* p. 166.

or γυνώσκ¹, to which they were addicted; or who were disposed to combine with Christianity, Jewish opinions, customs, and institutions. Several of these corrupters of religion are likewise expressly named; as *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, *Philetus*, *Hermogenes*, *Phygellus*, *Demas*, and *Diotrephes*². If, however, from this list, *Alexander*, *Hymeneus*, and *Philetus*, be excepted, the others appear chargeable rather with dereliction of duty, than corruption of religion³.

§ 2. So long as most of our Saviour's personal friends were alive, these men had but moderate success, and seem to have collected no great number of followers. But gradually they acquired more influence; and before the decease of all those whom *Christ* had himself instructed, they laid the foundations of those sects, which afterwards exceedingly disturbed the Christian community, and gave rise to so many contests. The history of these sects is very obscure; indeed, the most obscure part of ecclesiastical history. This obscurity arises, partly from the deficiency of ancient records; partly from the very tenets of these sects, which for the most part were singularly cloudy and remote from common apprehension; and partly from the ignorance and hostility of those who have written concerning them. This, however, is perfectly clear, that no

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 20; and ch. i. 3, 4. Tit. iii. 9. Colos. ii. 8.

² [Concerning *Diotrephes*, there is a particular tract, by Stemler, 1758. *Schl.*]³

³ 2 Tim. ii. 18, and elsewhere. See also the elaborate discussions concerning these men, by Camp. Vitranga, *Observ. Sacra*, lib. iv. cap. ix. p. 952. Thomas Ittig, *de Haresiarchis antiapostol.* sect. i. cap. viii. p. 84. J. Fr. Buddens, *de Ecclesia Apostolica*, cap. v. p. 292, &c.—[As to *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, we are informed by St. Paul, 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18, comp. 1 Tim. i. 19, 20, not only in general, that they had swerved from sound doctrine; but their particular error is pointed out. They taught, that a resurrection of the dead was no longer to be anticipated, it being already passed; and they laboured to make proselytes to this opinion. See J. G. Walch, *Exercit. de Hymenæo et Phileto*, in his *Miscell. Sacra*, p. 81, &c.—As to *Alexander*, it is still contested whether the *Alexander* in 1 Thn. i. 20; and 2 Tim.

iv. 14; and Acts ix. 33, be one and the same person. The greater part believe the affirmative. But Heumann (*Expos. of the N. T.* vol. vi. p. 363,) and Dr. Mosheim (*Comment. de Rebus Christ. ante C. M.* p. 178,) support the negative; being inclined to believe that there were two persons of this name. The younger Walch (*Entwurf der Ketzerereyen*, p. 127,) prefers abiding by the common opinion. *Hermogenes* and *Phygellus* are accused by Paul, 2 Tim. i. 15, of only having forsaken him when he was imprisoned at Rome, which was *inconstancy*, but not *heresy*. As to *Demas*, Paul tells us, 2 Tim. iv. 10, that, from love to the world, he had forsaken him. But this gives no ground for charging him with being a *heretic*.—*Diotrephes*, mentioned in the 3rd Ep. of John, is accused of a twofold fault; viz. refusing to receive those whom the apostle recommended to his kind offices, and setting himself in opposition to the apostle. But neither of these offences is sufficient to constitute him a heretic. *Schl.*]

one who loves the truths which the Bible inculcates, can find any thing to commend in the peculiarities of these sects⁴.

§ 3. At the head of all the sects, which disturbed the peace of the church, stand the Gnostics, who claimed ability to restore to mankind the lost knowledge (*γνώσις*) of the true and supreme God, and who announced the overthrow of that empire, which the Creator of the world and his associates had set up. It is, indeed, the common opinion, and supported by the testimony of Clemens Alexandrinus⁵, that the Gnostic sects first arose, *after the decease of the apostles*, in the reign of *Adrian*; and that previously no discords had produced separations from the church. But the sacred Scriptures themselves,—to say nothing of other ancient documents,—put it beyond controversy, that even in the *first* century, in various places, men infected with the Gnostic leprosy began to erect societies distinct from the other Christians⁶. Yet these stray flocks did not become distinguished for their numbers, or for fame and notoriety, till the times of *Adrian*. Under the appellation of Gnostics are included all those in the first ages of the church, who modified the religion of *Christ*, by joining with it the oriental philosophy, in regard to the source of evil,

⁴ Professed histories of the sects which arose in this and the next century have been written by Thom. Ittig, *de Hæresiarchis ævi apostolici et apostolico proximi*, Lips. 1690, 4to, and an Appendix, Lips. 1696, 4to, by Renatus Massuetus, *Dissert. Irenæo præmissæ*; and by Sebast. le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*. But all these, and others whom I pass over, have rather collected materials for a history of these sects, than written the history itself. Among the Lutherans, Abr. Hinekemann, *Ja. Thomasius*, Jo. Hen. Horbuis, and among the Reformed, Ja. Basnage and Henry Dodwell, have either promised the world such a history, or attempted to write it; but have done no more. We must therefore still wait for some person of adequate sagacity, fairness, and skill in ancient philosophy and literature, to accomplish this difficult undertaking. [This has been since attempted by C. W. F. Walch, *Entwurf einer vollständigen Historie der Ketzereyen*, &c. 11 vols. 8vo, 1762—85. N. Lardner, *Hist. of the Heretics*, Lond. 1780, 4to.

F. A. Lewald, *de Doctrina Gnostica*, Heideb. 1813, 8vo. A. Neander, *Genealogische Entwicklung d. vornehmsten gnost. Systeme*, Berlin, 1818, 8vo; and still better, in his *Allgem. Gesch. der chr. Relig. u. Kirche*, vol. i. pt. ii. p. 602—859. *Murd.*] The English reader will do well to consult upon this subject, Dr. Burton's *Inquiry into the Heresies of the Apostolic age*, being the Bampton Lectures for 1829. *Ed.*

⁵ *Stromatt.* l. vii. c. 17, pp. 898, 899.

⁶ 1 John ii. 18. 1 Tim. vi. 20. Col. ii. 8. [The reader will recollect, that Dr. Mosheim's opinions, concerning an oriental philosophy in the Apostolic age, have been much questioned (see Note⁸ p. 78); and that these texts, which speak only of false teachers who corrupted the truth, afforded no certain evidence of the existence of Gnostic churches or congregations, existing as distinct religious bodies. *Tr.*] "We may infer that the Gnostic opinions, or at least something like that which was afterwards called Gnosticism, was professed in the time of the apostles." Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, 30. *Ed.*

and the origin of this material universe. The leading principles of this philosophy have already been stated.

§ 4. All those eastern philosophers, believing that rational souls became connected with matter, and inhabitants of bodies, contrary to the will and pleasure of the supreme God, were in expectation of a mighty legate from the Deity, possessed of consummate wisdom and power, who would imbue, with a knowledge of the true God, the spirits now oppressed with the load of their bodies, and rescue them from bondage to the lords of this material world. When, therefore, some of them perceived that *Jesus* and his friends wrought miracles of a salutary character, they were ready to believe that *he* was that mighty legate of God, come to deliver men from the power of the genii, to whom they thought this world subject, and to free souls from their material bodies. This supposition being admitted into minds polluted with gross errors, they interpreted, or rather perverted, *whatever Christ* and his disciples taught, so as to make it harmonize with their *other* opinions.

§ 5. Hence there necessarily arose among them a multitude of opinions, extremely alien to the precepts of *Christ*. Their belief that the world was not created by the supreme God in whom is all perfection, but by one or more inferior deities, of a bad or at least of an imperfect character, would not allow them to admit the divine authority of the Old Testament Scriptures and it led some of them to venerate and extol the *serpent*, the prime author of sin among men, and likewise several of the vilest persons mentioned in the Jewish Scriptures. The same belief induced them to condemn *Moses*, and the religion that he taught, and to represent him as instigated to impose such hard and unsuitable laws on the Jews, by the world's creator, who had no regard for human happiness, but only for his own glory and authority. Their belief that *matter* is eternal and the source of all evil, prevented them from putting a due estimate upon the human body, and from favouring marriage, whereby bodies are produced, and also from admitting the doctrine of the future resurrection of the body. Their belief that malevolent genii ruled over the world, and that from them originated all the diseases, wars, and calamities of men, led them almost universally to addict themselves to *magic*, or the art of weakening and paralyzing the power of those genii.

I omit many other points, as not compatible with a history so summary as this.

§ 6. Their principles required, that while they admitted *Christ* to be the *Son* of the supreme God, and messenger sent from the *Pleroma* or upper world where God and his family dwell, for the benefit of miserable souls, they should hold most unworthy sentiments concerning his person and offices. They could not, indeed, either call him God, or a real man. True deity was inconsistent with their notion, that he was, although begotten of God, yet every way far *inferior* to the Father. Man he could not be, because they considered every thing concrete and corporeal intrinsically bad and vicious. Hence most of them divested *Christ* of a material body, and denied him to have really undergone for the sake of men those sufferings which are recorded of him. The cause of his coming among us, they said, was no other than to strip the capricious genii, who tyrannize in this world, of their power over virtuous and heaven-born souls, and to teach men how to withdraw the divine mind from the impure body, and to fit it for a union with God.

§ 7. Their systems of morals, we are informed, were widely different. For most of them recommended abstinence and austerity, and prescribed the most severe bodily mortifications; in order that the soul, whose ill fate it was to be associated with a body, might enjoy greater liberty, and be able the better to contemplate heavenly things. For, the more this depraved and grovelling habitation of the soul is weakened and attenuated, the less will it be able to withdraw the mind from the contemplation of divine objects. But some of them maintained, on the contrary, that we may safely indulge all our libidinous desires; and that there is no moral difference in human actions⁷. This contrariety of opinions need not surprise us; because the same principle naturally produced both systems. For persons who believed their bodies to be essentially evil, and meant for holding their souls in bondage, might, according as they were of a voluptuous or of a morose and austere disposition, either fall into the conclusion, that the acts of the body have no connexion with the soul when it has attained to communion with God, or, on the contrary, suppose

⁷ See Clemens Alex. *Stromat.* lib. iii. cap. v. p. 529, ed. Potter.

that the body must be strenuously resisted and opposed, as being the enemy of the soul.

§ 8. As these extraordinary opinions required proof, and as it was not easy to find any thing favourable to them in the writings of the apostles, refuge was necessarily taken in fables and impositions. Therefore, when asked where they had learned what they so confidently taught, some produced fictitious books, under the names of *Abraham*, *Zoroaster*, and *Christ*, or his apostles; others boasted of having derived their principles from a concealed and secret doctrine taught by *Christ*; others again affirmed that they had arrived at this high degree of wisdom, by an innate energy which existed in their own minds; and some pretended that one *Theudas*, a disciple of *St. Paul*, or *Matthias*, one of *Christ's* disciples, had been their teacher. Those of them who did not wholly reject the books of the New Testament, either interpreted them very absurdly, neglecting the true import of words, or dishonestly corrupted them, by retrenching what they disliked, and adding what they pleased.

§ 9. It is easy to see, how these persons after assuming the name of Christians, became divided into so many sects. In the first place, before their adhesion to *Christ*, as is clear from what has been said above, that they were already divided in opinion. Hence, as each one endeavoured to accommodate *his own* philosophical opinions to the Christian religion, it was the necessary consequence, that various systems of religion were produced. Moreover, some of them were born Jews, as *Cerinthus* and others, and did not wish to appear contemners of *Moses*: while others were wholly estranged from the Jewish religion, and could indulge themselves in liberties which the former could not. And lastly, this whole system of philosophy and religion, being without any fixed and solid basis, chiefly depended upon operations of the mind. Now, who does not know that variety is inseparable from systems and subjects which mind and imagination have under their control?

§ 10. The heads and leaders of the philosophical sects which troubled the church in the first century, next come to be considered. The first place among them is, by many, given to *Dositheus*, a Samaritan. And it is sufficiently proved, that there was a man of this name among the Samaritans, about the times of our Saviour; and that he left a sect behind him.

But all the extant accounts of this person clearly show that he is to be ranked, not among those called *heretics*, but among the enemies of the Christian name; or, if it be thought more correct, among the delirious and insane. For he wished himself to be thought the *Messiah*, or that Prophet whom God had promised to the Jews: he could not, therefore, have held *Jesus Christ* to be a divine ambassador; nor have merely corrupted *his* doctrines⁸.

§ 11. What I have said of Dositheus I would also say of the far-famed *Simon Magus*. This impostor is not to stand among those who corrupted Christianity by their own errors, that is, among *heretics*; but is to be thrust into that unhappy class which declared open war against it, in spite of the unanimity, with which writers generally, both ancient and modern, make him the *head*, *ringleader*, and *father* of the whole heretical camp. For it is manifest, from all the accounts which we have of him, that after his defection from the Christians, he ascribed to *Christ* no honour at all; but set *himself* in opposition to *Christ*, and said that he was no other than the supreme power of God⁹.

⁸ Ja. Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, l. ii. cap. xiii. p. 307. Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques*, par. M. du Pin, tom. iii. cap. xiii. p. 304. [Mosheim, *Inst. hist. Chr. major*. p. 376. C. W. F. Walch, *Ketzehistorie*, i. p. 182. All the accounts make Dositheus to have lived among the Samaritans; one writer represents him as an apostate Jew. According to Origen (*Philocal.* i.) he was a rigorous observer of the law of Moses, and particularly allowed no one to move from the spot where the sabbath overtook him. According to Epiphanius, (*Hæres.* lib. i. pt. i. hæres. 13, previous to the Christian heresies,) he was an apostate Jew, whose ambition being disappointed, he retired among the Samaritans, lived in a cave, and fasted so rigorously as to occasion his death. Other ancient accounts simply mention him among the founders of sects; as Hegesippus, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* l. iv. c. 22.—It is said, that his followers accounted him the Messiah; (Photius *Biblioth.* cxxx.)—and that he at first, claimed to be so; but afterwards retracted, in presence of his pupil Simon Magus (Clemens, *Recogn.* l. ii. 8, &c.); Eulogius, bp. of Alexandria, in the seventh century, wrote against the Dosi-

theans, (according to Photius, *Biblioth.* cxxx.) and besides his pretended messiahship, he attributes to Dositheus various errors, all of which coincided with either Sadducean or Samaritan opinions; See J. E. C. Schmidt, *Handb. d. christl. Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i. § 50, p. 214, &c. *Tr.*]

⁹ See Origen, *adv. Celsum*, lib. v. p. 272, ed. Spencer. "Simon probably was one of that class of adventurers which abounded at this period, or like Apollonius of Tyana, and others at a later time, with whom the opponents of Christianity attempted to confound Jesus and his apostles. His doctrine was oriental in its language and in its pretensions. He was the first *Æon*, or emanation, or rather, perhaps, the first manifestation of the primal Deity. He assumed not merely the title of the *Great Power*, or *Virtue of God*, but all the other appellations, the *Word*, the *Perfection*, the *Paraclete*, the *Almighty*, the whole combined attributes of the Deity." Milman's *Hist. of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire*. Lond. 1840, ii. 99.] The great power of God appears from Acts viii. 10, to have been a designation for their master in general vague

§ 12. There are such obvious discrepancies and inconsistencies in the accounts of *Simon's* life and opinions, given us by the ancients, that some very learned men deny the possibility of applying them to any single person; and accordingly, besides the Simon known as *Magus*, who abandoned the Christian religion, they suppose another, who was a Gnostic philosopher. On this point men must judge as they please; but to us it appears neither safe nor necessary to go from the testimony of the ancients, who speak of only *one* Simon¹. He was by birth either a Samaritan or a Jew, who after studying philosophy at Alexandria² made a public profession of magic, as was common in that age, and by fictitious prodigies, persuaded the Samaritans, among other things, that he had received from God the power of controlling those evil spirits which afflict mankind³. On seeing the miracles which *Philip* performed by divine power, Simon joined himself to him, professed to be a Christian, and hoped to learn from the Christians the art of working miracles. When cut off from this hope, by the severe language of *St. Peter*⁴, he not only returned to his old course of sorcery, but wherever he went

among Simon's disciples. For the other titles borne by him, Mr. Milman cites Jerome. His followers appear to have existed until very near the time of Origen. "Though it may be true that Simon Magus was an enemy to the progress and advancement of Christianity, though he cannot, in fact, be called a Christian, yet if he borrowed any part of the Christian scheme, and united it to his own, he would be called in ancient times an *heretic*, and the fathers assert that he was the parent of all heretics."—Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, 98. *Ed.*]

¹ See the Dissertation by G. C. Voelger, revised and published by Masheine, *Diss. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinentes*, vol. ii. p. 55, &c. de uno Simone Mago. [The idea of two Simons, the one a Samaritan, mentioned Acts viii., the other a Jewish philosopher, in the reign of Domitian, and the father of all the Gnostic sects, was first thrown out as a conjecture, by Camp. Vitringa, *Obsc. Sacrar.* l. v. c. 12, § 9, p. 159, and afterwards defended by C. A. Heumann, *Acta erudit. Lips.* for April, A.D. 1717, p. 179, and J. de Beausobre, *Diss. sur les Adamites*, pt. ii. subjoined to *L'Enfant's His-*

toire de la guerre des Hussites, § 1, p. 350, &c.—But this hypothesis is now generally given up. *Tr.*]

² *Clementina*, Homil. ii. in *Patr. Apostol.* tom. ii. p. 533. ["Justin Martyr, who was himself a Samaritan, informs us that Simon was a native of Gittum, a village in that country. Of his education we know nothing for certain; but in a work, which, although spurious, is of considerable antiquity, it is said that he studied at Alexandria, and was well versed in Grecian literature, as well as being a proficient in oratory and dialectics. That he studied at Alexandria, is not improbable; and he would have learnt in that city, what he seems undoubtedly to have professed, the doctrine of the Gnostics. The name of Gnosticism was, perhaps, not yet given to any particular sect of philosophers. But, as is generally the case in the progress of opinions, the thing existed, and had advanced a considerable way before it assumed a distinctive name."—Burton's *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First Century*, 75. *Ed.*]

³ Acts viii. 9, 10.

⁴ Acts viii. 20, *et seq.*

he laboured to obstruct the progress of Christianity. The accounts of his tragical death, and of a statue decreed him at Rome, are rejected with great unanimity by the learned at the present day. They are at least uncertain and improbable⁵.

§ 13. Simon undoubtedly belonged to that class of philosophers, who admitted, as co-existent with the supreme and all-perfect God, not only eternal *matter*, but also an *evil deity* who presided over it. And if I mistake not, he was one of those in this class, who believed matter to have been eternally animated, and at a certain period to have brought forth, by its inherent energies, that depraved being who now rules over it, surrounded by numerous attendants. From this opinion of Simon, the gross errors ascribed likewise to him by the ancients

⁵ See Is. de Beausobre, *Histoire de Maniché*, p. 203, 395. Anth. van Dale, *Diss. de Statua Simonis*, annexed to his book *de Oraculis*, p. 579. Sal. Deyling, *Observat. Sacrar.* l. i. Observ. xxxvi. p. 140. Seb. Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 340; and numerous others.—[What Arnobius, *adv. Gentes*, l. ii. p. 64, ed. Herald, and after him, many others relate, with some variety, concerning Simon's death; viz. that while practising magic at Rome, in order to ingratiate himself with Neró, he attempted to fly, being assisted by evil spirits; but that by the prayers of St. Peter, the evil spirits were compelled to let him fall, which either killed him outright, or broke his bones, and so mortified him, that he killed himself, is too improbable, and has too much the aspect of fiction to gain credit in this enlightened age.—And the mistake of Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. c. 34, who says he saw a public statue inscribed to Simon on an island in the Tiber at Rome, has been satisfactorily accounted for, since the discovery in the year 1574, of a stone in the Tiber at Rome, bearing this inscription: SEMONI SANCO, DEO FIDIO [(SACRUM). *Ell.*]. For this inscription, which Justin, being an Asiatic, might easily misunderstand, was undoubtedly intended for an ancient pagan God. *Tr.*—"The majority of learned men have since (since 1574) been of opinion, that Justin, deceived by the similarity of names, mistook a statue in honour of a Sabine deity, for one erected to Simon Magus." (Bp. Kaye's *Justin Martyr*,

Lond. 1829, p. 126.) The inscription on this marble fragment stands thus:—

SEMONI
SANCO
DEO FIDIO
SACRUM
SEX. POMPEIVS. SP. F.
COL. MYSSIANVS
QVINQVENNALIS
DECVR
BIDENTALIS
DONVM. DEDIT.

"It has been supposed, that this inscription misled Justin, who was not well versed in the Latin language, and that he mistook SEMONI SANCO for SIMONI SANCTO.—It is generally described as the base of a statue, but Baronius (ad an. 44) thinks it too small to have ever had a statue upon it. Tillemont, who supports Justin, gives an undue advantage to his opponents by saying, that a statue was discovered. The same mistake has been made by other writers." (Burton's *Dampton Lectures*, 375.) The Latin Fathers, Tertullian and Augustin, quote this famous inscription. With them ignorance of the language is out of the question; "and it is to be remembered, that Justin made this statement in a defence which he presented to the emperor Antoninus Pius, about the year 140, when he was himself at Rome; and it is difficult to believe, that he could have been so deceived concerning the history of Simon; or that he could have invented a story, which, if false, would have been detected, not only by the emperor, but by every person in Rome. Upon the whole, I am inclined

concerning *fate*, the *indifference of human actions*, the *human body's impurity*, *magic*, and other things naturally followed⁶. What was worse than all, he broached a shameless fiction, that the greatest and most powerful of the divine *Eons* of the male sex resided in himself; while another, of the female sex, the mother of all human souls, resided in his mistress *Helena*; and he declared himself to have come among men, by God's command, for the purpose of overthrowing the rule of those beings who made this world, and of delivering *Helena* from their power⁷.

§ 14. From Simon Magus it is said, *Menander*, who was also a Samaritan, learned *his* doctrine; which is no more true than what the ancients relate, that all the heretical sects derived their origin from this Simon. *Menander* is to be stricken

to admit it as a fact, that Simon Magus came to Rome in the reign of Claudius, and that his doctrine met with an extraordinary reception."—Burton's *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First Century*, 232. *Ed.*]

⁶ The dissertation of Jo. Hen. Horbius, *de Simone Mago*, though a juvenile production and needing correction in style, I prefer to all others on this subject. It will be found republished by Jo. Voigtius, in the *Biblioth. Hæresiologicalæ*, tom. i. pt. iii. p. 511. Horbius treads closely in the steps of his preceptor, Ja. Thomasius, who very clearly saw the source of those numerous errors by which the Gnostics, and especially Simon, were infected. The other writers who have treated of Simon, are enumerated by Voigtius, *ubi supra*, p. 567. [See C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketz.* vol. i. p. 152, &c. The English reader will find a full, but not a very accurate account of Simon in Calmet's *Dictionary of the Bible*. *Tr.*]

⁷ Some very learned men, I am aware, have supposed that the ancient accounts of Simon's *Helena*, should be interpreted allegorically; and that Simon intended, by the name of *Helena*, to indicate *matter*, or the *soul*, or something, I know not what. But for such an allegorical interpretation, it would be easy to show there is little foundation. [In Tertullian's treatise *de Animâ*, it is said that "Simon, indignant at the reproof which he received from St. Peter, determined in revenge to oppose the progress of the Gospel, and associated with himself in the

undertaking a Tyrian prostitute, named *Helena*. He called himself the Supreme Father, *Helena*, his first conception, through whom he formed the design of creating the angels and archangels. She, however, becoming acquainted with the design, went out from the Father into the lower parts of the universe, and there, anticipating his intention, created the angelic powers, who were ignorant of the Father, and were the artificers of this world. They detained her with them through envy, lest, if she went away, they should be deemed the offspring of another, that is, as I interpret the words, not self-existent. Not content with detaining her, they subjected her to every species of indignity, in order that the consciousness of her humiliation might extinguish even the wish to quit them. Thus they compelled her to take the human form, to be confined, as it were, in the bonds of the flesh, and to pass through different female bodies, among the rest, through that of the Spartan *Helen*, until at length she appeared as the *Helena* of Simon. She was the lost sheep mentioned in the parable, whom Simon descended to recover, and restore to heaven. Having effected his purpose, he determined in revenge to deliver mankind from the dominion of the angelic powers, and in order to elude their vigilance, he pretended to assume the human form, appearing as the Son in Judea, as the Father in Samaria." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 576. *Ed.*]

from the list of those who may be properly called heretics, and classed among the senseless and infatuated coxcombs, who were led by a silly arrogance to play the Saviour of mankind. It is clear from the testimonies of *Irenæus*, *Justin Martyr*, and *Tertullian*⁸, that he wished to be thought one of the *Æons*, sent from the upper world or the *Pleroma*, to succour the souls that were here suffering miserably in material bodies, and to afford them aid against the machinations and the violence of the demons who governed our world. As he erected his religious system on the same fundamental principles as Simon did his, the ancients supposed that he must have been a disciple of Simon⁹.

§ 15. If those now mentioned are not reckoned among the *heretics* of the first century, the first place among the Christian sects, and also among those denominated Gnostics, seems to belong to the *Nicolaitans*, of whom *Jesus Christ* himself expressed his detestation¹. The Saviour, it is true, does not tax them with errors in matters of *faith*, but only with licentious *conduct*, and a disregard of the injunction of the apostles to abstain from meats offered to idols, and from fornication². But the writers of the second and the following centuries, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*³, and others, declare that they taught the same doctrines with the Gnostics, concerning *two principles* of things, the *Æons*, and this world's origin. Whether this testimony is to be admitted, or whether we are to suppose that the ancients confounded *two* different sects which bore the same name: the one, the *Apocryphical Nicolaitans*; and the other, a Gnostic sect of the second century, founded by a man named *Nicolaus*; is a question which admits of doubt⁴.

⁸ [Irenæus, lib. i. c. 23. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii. p. 69. Tertullian, *de Animâ*, cap. 50, and *de Resurrect.* c. 5. *Tr.*]

⁹ "Tertullian mentions Menander, the Samaritan, as the disciple of Simon Magus, and the master of Saturninus. One of his assertions was, that he was sent by the Supreme Power, to make all who received his baptism, immortal and incorruptible: in other words, his baptism was itself the resurrection, and delivered all who partook of it from liability to death. Another of his opinions was, that the human body was created by angels." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 577. *Ed.*]

¹ Apoc. ii. 6, 14, 15.

² Acts xv. 29.

³ [Irenæus, lib. iii. c. 11, and i. ii. c. 27. Tertull. *de Præscript.* c. 46. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. iii. c. 4. *Tr.*]

⁴ [See *Demonstratio Sectæ Nicolaitarum*, adf. doctiss. ejus oppugnatore, cum Supplemento; in Mosheim's *Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinent.* vol. i. p. 349—495. Also Mosheim's *Institut. Hist. Christ. major.* p. 46, and *Comment. de Rebus Christ. ante Constant. M.* p. 195, and especially C. W. F. Walch, *Entw. d. Gesch. d. Ketzerereyen*, vol. i. p. 167. All the ancients, except John Cassianus, (*Collatio*, xviii. c. 16,) supposed

§ 16. With greater propriety, we may reckon among the Gnostics, *Cerinthus*, a Jew by birth⁵, but initiated in letters and philosophy at Alexandria⁶. Some of the learned have, indeed, chosen to assign him rather to the *second* century than to the first⁷, yet it appears to have been while *St. John* was still living, that he ventured upon forming a strange kind of system and religion, by combining the doctrines and principles of *Jesus Christ*, with those of the Gnostics and Jews. From the Gnostics he borrowed the notions of a *Pleroma*, *Æons*, a *Demi-*

(that *Nicolaus* of Antioch, the Deacon, (*Acts* vi. 5.) was either the founder or accidental cause of this sect. Irenæus makes him to have been the founder of it. But *Clemens Alex.* states, that an incautious speech or act of his, gave occasion only to this sect. For he being one day accused of too much attention to his wife, when he came to defend himself, he publicly divorced her; using the expression, ὅτι παραχρησάσαι τῇ σαρκὶ δέη, *it is proper to abuse the flesh; i. e.* to subdue its corrupt propensities. This speech was afterwards perversely applied by a Gnostic association to justify their abominations. To this account agree *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccl.* i. iii. c. 29. *Theodoret*, *Hæret. Fabul.* i. iii. c. i. tom. iv. Opp. p. 226, and *Augustine*, *de Hæres.* cap. 5. Now the question arises, whether there actually was, in the time of *St. John*, an heretical party holding different fundamental principles from the orthodox, and distinguished by the name of *Nicolaitans*. Some say there was, others say there was not. *Dr. Mosheim* takes the affirmative, on account of the historical credibility of the Fathers, and the literal import of the words used in the *Apocalypse*. The next question is, Who was the founder of this sect? Here, some follow *Irenæus*; others follow *Clemens Alex.*; and some, among whom is *Dr. Mosheim*, think it probable, there were two persons of the name of *Nicolaus*. If this supposition be admitted, it will be easy to account for the fact, that the *Nicolaitans* of the Fathers are accused of Gnosticism, while there is no mention of it in the *Apocalypse*.—*Baumgarten's Auszug der Kirchengeschichte*.—*Schl.*] “Towards the end of the century there were some Gnostics who did not scruple to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and these men were known by the name of *Nicolaitans*. The origin of the term is uncertain; and though *Nicolaus*, the deacon, has been

mentioned as their founder, the evidence is extremely slight which would convict that person of any immoralities.” *Burton's Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First Century*, 364. *Ed.*]

⁵ [For *Epiphanius* states, *Hæres.* xxviii. § 3, that he was circumcised; and *Johannes Damascenus*, *de Hæres.* cap. 8, that his followers were *Jews*. His doctrines also show higher respect for the Jewish forms of worship than is common for the Gnostic heretics. *Walch's Entw. der Historie der Ketz.* vol. i. p. 250. *Schl.*]

⁶ *Theodoret*, *Fabul. Hæret.* lib. ii. cap. 3. Opp. tom. iii. p. 219.

⁷ See *Sam. Basiage*, *Annal. Polit. Eccles.* tom. ii. p. 6, *Peter Faydit*, *Eclaircissements sur l'histoire ecclési. de deux premiers siècles*, cap. v. p. 64, and others.—With these, *Jo. Fr. Buddeus* contends, *de Ecclesia Apostol.* cap. v. p. 412, [and *Tillemont*, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. p. 486, and *Mosheim*, *Institut. Hist. Eccles. major.* sec. i. p. 439, &c. They who place *Cerinthus* in the second century, rely chiefly on two arguments. The first is, that the ancient writers who treat of the heretics, set down *Cerinthus* after *Marcion*, [rather after *Carpocrates*. *Tr.*]—the other rests on a spurious letter of *Pius*, bishop of Rome [in the middle of the second century, *Tr.*] to *Justus*, bishop of *Vienne*; in which *Pius* laments that *Cerinthus* was at that time making many proselytes. The epistle may be found in *Constant. Epistol. Pontific. Append.* tom. i. p. 19, [and in *Binius*, *Concil. Gen.* tom. i. p. 124. *Tr.*]—But the first argument proves nothing, because the historians of the heresies pay no regard to chronological order; and the second falls, because the epistle is not genuine. *Schl.*]—But see on this subject, *Fr. Ad. Lampe*, *Commentar. in Johann. Proleg.* lib. ii. c. 3, § 13, &c. p. 181, &c. *Tr.*]

urge, and the like, but modified, so as to make them seem not quite inconsistent with Jewish opinions. Thus to the creator of this world, whom he thought likewise the lord and lawgiver of the Jewish nation, he ascribed a *nature* possessed of the highest virtues, and sprung from God himself, but one, he added, which had gradually declined from its native excellence, and fallen upon things unworthy of it. Hence *God* had determined to subvert his power through one of the most blessed *Æons*, whose name was *Christ*. This *Christ* had entered into a certain Jew named *Jesus*, (a very righteous and holy man, the son of *Joseph* and *Mary*, by ordinary generation,) by descending upon him in the form of a dove, at the time when he was baptized by John in the river Jordan. After his union with *Christ*, this *Jesus* vigorously assailed the god of the Jews, the world's creator; and by *his* instigation, *Jesus* was seized by the rulers of the Jewish nation and nailed to the cross. But when *Jesus* was apprehended, *Christ* flew away to heaven; so that only the man *Jesus* was put to death. *Cerinthus* required his followers to worship the supreme God, the father of *Christ*, together with *Christ* himself, but to abandon the Jewish Lawgiver, whom he accounted the creator of this world; and, while they retained some parts of the Mosaic law, to regulate their lives, chiefly by the precepts of *Christ*. He promised them a resurrection of their bodies, which would be succeeded by exquisite delights, in the millenary reign of *Christ*; and then would follow a happy and never-ending life in the celestial world. For *Cerinthus* supposed that *Christ* would hereafter return, and would unite himself again with the man *Jesus*, in whom he had before dwelt, and would reign with his followers during a thousand years in Palestine*.

* [The doctrines of *Cerinthus* are stated in full by C. W. F. Walch, *Entwurf der Gesch. d. Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 260, &c. and by Mosheim, *Institut. hist. Christ. major*, p. 445, and *Comment. de rebus Christianor. ante Constant. M.* p. 196.—It may be remarked that Irenæus, *adv. Hæres.* l. iii. c. 3, says he had heard from various persons, that Polycarp told them, that the apostle John once met *Cerinthus* in a public bath at Ephesus, and instantly fled out, saying he was afraid the bath would fall on that enemy of the truth and kill him. This story may be true, notwithstanding Irenæus

had it from third-hand testimony. But the addition to it, that *Cerinthus* was actually killed by the fall of the building, as soon as John was gone out, was first annexed in modern times by the Dominican Bernhard of Luxemburg, in his *Catalogus Hæreticorum*, and it deserves no credit. See Walch, *ubi supra*, p. 255. *Schl.*] *Cerinthus* "seems to have had his residence for some time at Ephesus; and he found the people in that country but too well disposed to embrace his doctrines. He inculcated, as I have stated, the greatest laxity of morals." Irenæus says that St. John

§ 17. Those who maintained the necessity of the Mosaic law and ceremonies in order to eternal salvation, had not proceeded so far in this century as to have no communion with such as thought differently. They were, therefore, accounted brethren, though weaker ones. But after the second destruction of Jerusalem in the reign of *Adrian*, when they withdrew from other Christians and set up separate congregations, they were regarded as *sectarians*, who had deviated from the true doctrines of *Christ*. Hence arose the names, *Nazarenes*⁹ and *Ebionites*¹; by which those Christians, who erred from excess-

wrote his Gospel "to root out the erroneous doctrine, which had been spread by Cerinthus, and some time before by the Nicolaitans." (Burton's *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First Century*, 364, 373.) "According to Irenæus, Cerinthus taught that the world was created by a power quite subordinate to the highest God, which did not even so much as know this God, who was elevated above every thing. According to Epiphanius, he held that the world was created by angels." (Rose's *Neander*, ii. 51.) Neander subsequently expresses a doubt whether Cerinthus thought the creating angels really ignorant of the Supreme God, but rather inclines to a belief that he considered their acquaintance with the paramount Deity, and his abode, imperfect; fuller information upon such subjects waiting for a revelation through the divine *Logos*, or *Word*. At the head of the creating angels was placed one who promulgated the Mosaic law, which Cerinthus represented as greatly superior to any anterior religious system, but immeasurably below the Messiah's revelation. He considered Jesus chosen to make this on account of his extraordinary qualities, intellectual, moral, and religious. But he himself had no suspicion of his destination to this illustrious office, until he was baptized by John, when the Supreme *Logos*, or Spirit of God, came down upon him from heaven, in the likeness of a dove, and sank into his heart. He was thus connected with the Supreme God, and hence elevated in rank, power, and wisdom above this whole world, and the angels who preside over it. He now had such a perfect knowledge of the Supreme God, and of heavenly things, that the angels might learn of him, and it was by virtue of the Spirit united

with him, that he wrought miracles. While this union continued, suffering was impossible; but the Spirit flew up again to the Father, and the man Jesus was violently cut off. *Ed.*]

⁹ [This name the Jews first gave, by way of reproach, to the disciples of Christ, because he was a citizen of Nazareth. *Acts* xxiv. 5. Afterwards the name was applied, especially to a Christian sect, which endeavoured to unite the Mosaic law with the religion of Christ. Of these Nazarenes, Mosheim treats largely, *Institut. hist. Christ. major*. p. 465, and *Comment. de rebus Christ. ante Const. M.* p. 328, as also C. W. F. Walch, *Ente. d. Gesch. d. Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 101, &c. *Schll.*] "Epiphanius, who lived in the fourth century, is the earliest writer that speaks of the Nazarenes as heretics, and it is plain from his account, that they were not many in number." Burton's *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First Century*, 350. *Ed.*]

¹ [The origin of this name is still a subject of controversy. Some derive it from some founder of this sect, who was called Ebion. Others think the name *Ebionites* to be equivalent to the Hebrew word עֲבִיּוֹנִים *poor people*. But they are not agreed, why this name was given to the sect. Others, again, regard the whole subject as an historical problem, that can never be solved with absolute certainty. It is treated of largely by C. W. F. Walch, *Entwurf der Gesch. d. Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 110, and by Mosheim, *Institut. historiae Christ. major*. p. 477; and in his *Diss. qua ostenditur, certo hodie et explorare constitui non posse, utrum Ebion quidam nove Sectæ auctor existerit olim inter Christianos, necne?* in his *Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinent.* vol. i. p. 547, &c. See also Chr.

sive attachment to the Mosiac law, were distinguished from their brethren generally, whose opinion was, that the system established by Moses had been abrogated by *Christ*. These *Nazarenes* or *Ebionites*, however, though commonly set down among the sects of the apostolic age, really belong to the *second* century, in which they first attracted notice.

Alb. Doederlein, *Commentar. de Ebion-
ais e numero hostium Christi eximendis*,
Blizow. 1770, 8vo. *Schl.*] — "It has
been disputed whether there ever was
a person called Ebion; but it is agreed
on all hands that *Ebion* was a Jewish
word, which signified *poor*. It is im-
possible not to connect the Ebionites
in many respects with the Jews; but,
at the same time, they held opinions
from which an orthodox Jew would
have started with horror. It is suf-
ficient to mention, that they treated

the writings of the prophets with con-
tempt, and denied their inspiration. So
also, while we find that the name of
Jesus held a conspicuous place in their
creed, we find them also believing him
to be born of human parents, and main-
taining that Christ was an emanation
from God, which descended upon Jesus
at his baptism. All these peculiarities
are explained, when it is stated that the
Ebionites were a branch of the Gnostics,"
Barton's *Lectures upon the Ecclesiastical
History of the First Century*, 351.]

CENTURY SECOND.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Character of the Roman emperors.—§ 2. Propagation of Christianity in the Roman empire.—§ 3. Countries enlightened by Christianity.—§ 4. Conversion of the Germans.—§ 5. The Gauls converted.—§ 6. Translations of the N. T.—§ 7. Apologies and other writings of Christians.—§ 8. Miracles and extraordinary gifts.—§ 9. Miracle of the thundering legion.—§ 10. It is uncertain.—§ 11. Sedition and slaughter of the Jews.—§ 12. Philosophers become Christians.

§ 1. Most of those who governed Rome in this age, were of the milder cast. *Trajan*¹, though too eager for glory, and not always sufficiently considerate and provident, was a kind and clement prince. *Adrian*² was rather harsher, yet still not absolutely bad or unjust, but, in fact, a compound of virtues and vices. Than the *Antonines*³ nothing could be better and more benign. Even *Severus*⁴, who afterwards assumed another character, was at first oppressive to no one, and to the Christians mild and equitable.

§ 2. Through this lenity of the emperors, Christians living in the Roman empire suffered far less than they would have

¹ A. D. 98—117.

² A. D. 117—138.

³ Pius, A. D. 133—161. Marcus Aurelius the Philosopher, A. D. 161—180, with

Verus, A. D. 161—169, and Commodus, A. D. 169—192.

⁴ A. D. 193—211.

done if they had been under severer lords. The laws enacted against them were indeed sufficiently hard; and the magistrates, excited by the priests and the populace, often made considerable havoc among them, and went frequently much beyond what the laws required. Yet for these evils some relief was commonly attainable. *Trajan* would not have the *Christians to be sought after*; and ordered no account to be taken of anonymous accusations against them⁵. *Antoninus Pius* even decreed, that their accusers should be punished⁶. Some in one way, and others in another, protected them against the evil designs of the populace and the priests. Hence the Christian community increased, and became vastly numerous in this century. Of this fact we have the clearest testimony of the

⁵ See Pliny's *Epistles*, lib. x. ep. 98. [This is a short epistle from the emperor in answer to a long one, which stands immediately before it, and which seeks the imperial direction in dealing with proceedings against Christians. Among the engines which assailed them, were anonymous accusations affecting many individuals. Pliny says, *propositus est libellus sine auctore, multorum nomina continens*. When considerable numbers were apprehended upon such information, many of them seem immediately to have disclaimed Christianity, and to have paid, in confirmation, divine honours to the gods. Trajan thus disposes of the anonymous accusers: *sine auctore vero propositi libelli nullo crimine locum habere debent*. It is evident also that he wished them to be unmolested, as he said, *conquirendi non sunt*, but he did not venture to promise them security. If regularly convicted, they were to pay the legal penalty. *Si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt*. But then he would not allow any to be punished who took part in heathen rites, when called in question, however suspicious their former conduct might have been. *Qui negaverit se Christianum esse, idque re ipsa manifestum fecerit, id est, supplicando dis nostris, quævis suspectus in præteritum fuerit, veniam et penitentia impetret*. This, though a strong temptation to sinful compliances for a temporary purpose, was an important protection against malicious feelings and sinister designs. Trajan's letter does not, however, manifest religious feeling of any kind. Even in forbidding governors to act upon anonymous information, it goes no farther than stamping such pro-

ceedings as highly dangerous, and unworthy of an enlightened age. *Pessimi exempli, nec nostri seculi est*. "Trajan writes like an honourable soldier, not like a philosopher or a lawgiver studying the good of mankind. His approbation of Pliny's general conduct was harsh and severe. His saying that Christians were not to be searched for, shows an opinion of their innocence, and also some fear of them; his adding, that they were to be punished, if brought before him, is scarcely just. Tertullian is eloquent upon this inconsistency.—Pliny had the government of the province of Bithynia, or Pontus and Bithynia; but he was not called *proconsul*, only *proprætor* with proconsular power: his letter to Trajan was written from his province, and might be dated in the year 106 or 107." Hey's *Lectures*, i. 202. *Ed.*]

⁶ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. cap. 13. [where the law of Antoninus is given at length from the Apology of Melito. Some indeed have supposed that it was Marcus Antoninus, and not Antoninus Pius, who issued this decree. (So Valerius in loc.) But this is contrary to the express testimony of Eusebius, and to the contents of the edict itself. For we know from history, that the earthquakes mentioned in the edict happened under Pius. See Capitolinus, *Life of Antoninus Pius*, cap. 3. Besides, if Marcus himself had published this edict, Melito could have had no occasion, by this Apology, to implore the grace of the emperor in favour of the Christians. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. ante Constant. M.* p. 240. *Schd.*]

ancients, which some have vainly attempted to call in question⁷.

§ 3. On what particular countries, both within the Roman empire and beyond it, the light of heavenly truth first shone in this century, the scantiness of ancient records will not allow us to state with precision. There are unexceptionable witnesses, who declare, that in nearly all the East, and among the Germans, Spaniards, Celts, Britons, and other nations, *Christ* was now worshipped as God⁸. But if any inquire, which of these nations received Christianity in *this* century, and which in the preceding? it is not in my power to answer.—*Pantænus*, master of the school in Alexandria, is said to have instructed the Indians in Christianity⁹. But these Indians appear to have

⁷ See Walt. Moyle, *de Legionē fulminatrice*; a Latin translation of which, with notes, I have annexed to my *Synagoga Diss. ad sanctiores disciplinas pertinent*, p. 652, 661. See also an additional passage, in Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryphone*, p. 341.

⁸ *Irenæus, adv. Hæres.* l. i. c. 10, *Tertullian, adv. Judeos*, cap. 7. [The testimony of the former, is this: "Neither do those churches, which are established among the Germans; believe or teach otherwise; nor do those among the Hiberii, or among the Celts; nor those in the East; nor those in Egypt; nor those in Libya; nor those established in the *central parts of the world*."—The language of Tertullian is rhetorical, and the statement, undoubtedly, somewhat too strong. He says: "In whom, but the Christ now come, have all nations believed? For, in whom do all other nations (but yours, the Jews,) confide? Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phrygia, Cappadocia, and inhabitants of Pontus and Asia and Pamphylia; the dwellers in Egypt, and inhabitants of the region beyond Cyrene, Romans and strangers; and in Jerusalem both Jews and proselytes; so that the various tribes of the Gætuli and the numerous hordes of the Mauri; all the Spanish clans, and the different nations of Gauls, and the regions of the Britons inaccessible to the Romans but subject to Christ, and of the Sarmatians, and the Dacians, and Germans, and Scythians, and many unexplored nations, and countries and islands unknown to us, and which we cannot enumerate:—in all which places, the name of the

Christ who has already come, now reigns." *Tr.*]

⁹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. v. c. 10. Jerome, *de Scriptoribus Illustr.* c. 36. [According to Eusebius, the zeal of Pantænus prompted him to undertake a voluntary issue among the Indians. But according to Jerome, (*de Scriptoribus Illustr.* c. 36, and epist. 83, Opp. tom. iv. pt. ii. p. 656, ed. Bened.) he was sent out by Demetrius, bp. of Alexandria, in consequence of a request made by the Indians for a Christian teacher. Perhaps Pantænus first spontaneously travelled among the nearer Arabians; and, upon the request of the people here, called Indians, for a teacher, Demetrius directed him to visit that people.—As it is well known that the Greek and Latin writers give the name of Indians to the Persians, Parthians, Medes, Arabians, Ethiopians, Libyans, and many other nations, to them little known, the learned have inquired who were the Indians visited by Pantænus? Many think they were those we call the East Indians, inhabiting the country about the river Indus. Jerome so thought; for he represents him as sent to instruct the Brahmans. Hen. Valesius and Lu. Holstenius and others suppose they were the Abyssinians or Ethiopians, who are often called Indians, and were near, and always had intercourse with the Egyptians. See S. Basnage, *Annal. polit. ecclæs.* tom. ii. p. 207. Valesius, *Adnotat. ad Socratis Hist. Ecclæs.* p. 13. Others incline to believe them Jews, resident in Yemen or Arabia Felix, a country often called India. That they were not strangers to Chris-

been certain Jews, living in Arabia Felix. For Pantæus found among them, according to the testimony of *Jerome*, the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, which they had received from their first teacher *Bartholomew*.

§ 4. From *Gaul*, it would seem, the Christian religion must have spread into *Germany* on the left of the *Rhine*, which was subject to the Romans, and also into *Britain* over against *Gaul*¹. Yet certain churches in *Germany* have been accustomed to deduce their origin from the companions and disciples of *St. Peter* and other apostles²; and the Britons, following *Bede*, would fain believe, that their king *Lucius* sought and obtained Christian teachers from *Eleutherus* the Roman pontiff, in this century, and during the reign of *Marcus Antoninus*³. But these ancient accounts are exposed to much doubt, and are rejected by the best-informed persons.

tianity, is evident from their having *Matthew's Gospel* among them, and from their desiring some one to expound it to them. Their applying to the bishop of *Alexandria* shows that *Egypt* was to them the most accessible Christian country; and their having the *Gospel* written in *Hebrew*, as *Jerome* testifies, is good proof that they were Jews; because no other people understood that language. Besides, *Bartholomew* had formerly been among them, the field of whose labours has been supposed to be *Arabia Felix*. See *Tillemont's* life of *Bartholomew*, in his *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 1160, 1161.—See *Mosheim, de Rebus Christ. ante C. M.* p. 206, 207. Tr.]

¹ On the origin of those German churches, mentioned by *Tertullian* and *Ireneus*, as existing in this century, *Jo. Hen. Ursinus*, *Bebelius*, and others have written; and still better, *Gabriel Liron*, *Singularitez historiques et littéraires*, tom. iv. Paris, 1740, 8vo.—The common and popular accounts of the first preachers of the *Gospel* in *Germany*, are learnedly impugned by *Aug. Cabnet, Histoire de Lorraine*, tom. i. *Diss. sur les Evêques de Treves*, p. 3, 4. *Bolland, Acta Sanctorum*, January, tom. ii. p. 922. *Jo. Nic. de Hontheim, Diss. de ara episcopat. Trevirensis*; in *Historie Trevirensis* tom. i.

² [It is said, *St. Peter* sent *Eucherius*, *Valerius*, and *Maternus* into *Belgic Gaul*; and that they planted the churches of *Cologne*, *Treves*, *Tüngres*, *Liege*, and some others; and presided over them

till their death. See *Christo. Brower, Annales Trevirenses*, l. ii. p. 143, &c., and *Acta Sanctor. Antverpiensia*, 29th of January, p. 918.—But *Cabnet*, *Bolland*, and *Hontheim*, (*ubi supra*.) have proved satisfactorily, that these pretended founders of the German churches did not live earlier than the third or fourth century, and were first represented as being legates of the apostles in the middle ages.—See *Mosheim, de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 212. Tr.]

³ See *Ja. Ussher, Antiquitates Ecclesiar. Britannicar.* cap. i. p. 7. *Francis Godwin, de Conversione Britann.* cap. i. p. 7. *Rapin de Thoyras, History of England*, vol. i. [Wil. Burton, *Adnotat. ad Clementis Rom. epist. ad Corinth.* in *Patribus Apostol.* tom. ii. p. 470. *Edw. Stillingfleet, de Antiquitate Ecclesiar. Britann.* cap. i. *Fred. Spanheim, Historia Eccles. major.* secul. ii. p. 603, 604.—The first publication of the *Gospel* in *Britain*, has been attributed to *James* the son of *Zebedee*, whom *Herod* put to death, (*Acts* xii. 1.) to *Simon Zelotes*, another apostle, to *Aristobulus*, (mentioned *Rom.* xvi. 10,) to *St. Peter*, &c. by some few legendary writers, who are cited by *Ussher, Ecclesiar. Britann. Primordia*, cap. i.—But rejecting these accounts, *William of Malmesbury*, and after him many other monks, maintained that *Joseph of Arimathea*, with twelve others, were sent from *Gaul*, by *St. Philip*, into *Britain*, a. d. 63; that they were successful in planting Christianity; spent their lives in *England*; had twelve

§ 5. Transalpine Gaul, which is now called *France*, perhaps received some knowledge of the Gospel before this century, either from the apostles or from their friends and disciples. But unequivocal proofs of the existence of churches in this part of Europe first occur in the present century. For in it *Pothinus*, a man of distinguished piety and devotedness to *Christ*, in company with *Irenæus* and other holy men, proceeded from Asia to Gaul, and there instructed the people with such success, that he gathered churches of Christians at *Lyons* and *Vienne*, of which *Pothinus* himself was the first bishop⁴.

hides of land assigned them by the king at Glastonbury, where they first built a church of hurdles, and afterwards established a monastery. By maintaining the truth of this story, the English clergy obtained the precedence of some others in several councils of the fifteenth century, and particularly that of Basil, A. D. 1434. (Ussher's *Primordia*, ch. ii. p. 12–30.) Since the reformation this story has been given up by most of the English clergy. But, as Eusebius (*Demonstrat. Evang.* l. iii. c. 5,) and Theodoret (*Græcar. Curatio Affectionum*, l. ix.) name the Britons, among others, to whom the *Apostles* themselves preached the Gospel, some have maintained that St. Paul must have visited that country; and they urge that Clemens Rom. says, that this apostle travelled ἐπὶ τὰ ἄκρα τῆς ὀρέας, to the utmost bounds of the west. They also urge, that among the many thousand Romans who passed over into Britain in the reign of Claudius and his successors, there were doubtless some Christians, who would spread the knowledge of Christ there. But the principal reliance has been on the reported application of king Lucius to pope Eleutherus for Christian teachers, about A.D. 150, or rather 176. (Ussher, *Primordia*, ch. iv. p. 44, &c.)—On all these traditions, Dr. Mosheim passes the following judgment: “Whether any apostle, or any companion of an apostle, ever visited Britain, cannot be determined; yet the balance of probability rather inclines towards the affirmative. The story of Joseph of Arimathea might arise from the arrival of some Christian teacher from Gaul, in the second century, whose name was Joseph. As the Gauls, from Dionysius, bp. of Paris in the second century, made Dionysius the Areopagite to be their apostle; and the Germans

made Maternus, Eucherius, and Valerius, who lived in the third and fourth centuries, to be preachers of the first century, and attendants on St. Peter; so the British monks, I have no doubt, made a certain Joseph, from Gaul, in the second century, to be Joseph of Arimathea.—As to Lucius, I agree with the best British writers, in supposing him to be the restorer and second father of the English churches, and not their original founder. That he was a king is not probable; because Britain was then a Roman province. He might be a nobleman, and governor of a district. His name is Roman. His application I can never believe was made to the bp. of Rome. It is much more probable, he sent to Gaul for Christian teachers. The independence of the ancient British churches on the see of Rome, and their observing the same rights with the Gallic churches, which were planted by Asiatics, and particularly in regard to the time of Easter, show that they received the Gospel from Gaul, and not from Rome.”—See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 213, &c.—*Tr.* The name Lucius may be merely a Latin form of a British word: but the application attributed to this prince is open to strong suspicion. It first appeared in the *Customs of London*, published under Henry VIII., and nothing is known of any authority to substantiate it. Yet such as it is, little or nothing can be collected from it in favour of the Roman see, the very service into which it is generally pressed. Lucius might seem to have requested the pope to send him “a copy of the Roman and imperial laws, with a design to make them the rule of justice in the realm of Britain.” Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, Lond. 1706, i. 14. *Ed.]*

⁴ Peter de Marca, *Epistola de Eran-*

§ 6. This rapid propagation of Christianity is ascribed by the writers of the second century almost exclusively to the

gelii in Gallia initiis, published among his dissertations, and also by Valesius, subjoined to *Eusebii Historia Eccles. Jo. Launoi, Opuscula*, in his *Opp.* tom. ii.—*Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. i. p. 223. Gabr. Liron, *Singularités historiques et littéraires*; the whole fourth volume, Paris, 1740, 8vo, and others.—[The most eminent French writers have disputed about the origin of their churches. Three different opinions have been advanced. The first is that of Jo. Launoi, (*ubi supra*), whom many writers of eminence at this day follow. It is, that if we except the Asiatic colonists of Lyons and Vienne, among whom there were Christian churches formed about A.D. 150, the first propagation of Christianity among the Transalpine Gauls was by missionaries from Rome about A.D. 250. This hypothesis is founded chiefly on the testimony of three ancient writers; viz. Sulpicius Severus, *Historia Sacra*, lib. ii. c. 32, where speaking of the persecution at Lyons and Vienne, under Marcus Antoninus, (A.D. 177,) he says: *Ac tunc primum inter Gallias martyria visa; serius trans Alpes Dei religione suscepta; these were the first martyrs among the Gauls; for the divine religion was not received till late beyond the Alps.* The next testimony is that of the author of the *Acts of Saturninus*, bishop of Toulouse, who suffered under Decius. The author is supposed to have written in the beginning of the fourth century. He says: *Raras tertio sæculo in aliquibus Galliarum civitatibus ecclesias paucorum Christianorum devotione consurrexisse: scattering churches of a few Christians, arose in some cities of Gaul in the third century.* See T. Ruinart, *Acta Martyr. sincera*, p. 130. The third testimony is that of Gregory of Tours, the father of French history, (in the *Historia Francor.* lib. i. cap. 27, and *de Gloria Confessorum*, cap. 30, ed. Ruinart, p. 399.) He says, *sub Decio septem viros ad prædicandum Romæ in Galliam missos esse: under Decius, (A.D. 248—251,) seven missionaries were sent from Rome to preach in Gaul.* Now these seven missionaries are the very persons, who are said to have been sent thither by St. Paul and St. Peter; viz. Trophimus bishop of Arles, Stremonius bishop of Clermont, Martial bishop of Limoges, Paul bishop of Narbonne, Saturninus bishop of Toulouse,

Gratian bishop of Tours, and Dionysius bishop of Paris. The second opinion is, that of the strenuous advocates for the apostolic origin of the Gallic churches, Peter de Marca (*ubi supra*), Natalis Alexander (*Histor. Eccles. Sæcul. I. diss.* 16, 17, vol. iii. p. 356—420, ed. Paris, 1741, 4to,) and others. They consider St. Paul and St. Peter as the fathers of their church. Paul, they suppose, travelled over nearly all France, in his supposed journey to Spain; and also sent St. Luke and Crescens into that country. For the last, they allege 2 *Tim.* iv. 10, “Crescens to Galatia;” or rather to Gaul, according to Epiphanius and others, who, for *Galatia*, would read *Galatia*. St. Peter, they suppose, sent Trophimus his disciple into Gaul. St. Philip, they also suppose, laboured in Gaul. And the seven bishops, above mentioned, they say, were sent by the apostles from Rome.—Very few at this day embrace the opinion entire. It rests principally on very suspicious testimony or conjectures, and on vulgar traditions. The third opinion takes a middle course, between the first and the second: and is that which is maintained by Gabr. Liron, *Diss. sur l’Établissement de la religion Chrétienne dans les Gauls*; in the fourth volume of his *Singularités historiques*, &c. Paris, 1740, 8vo. It admits that Launoi, Sirmont, and Tillemont have fully proved, that Dionysius, the first bishop of Paris, was not Dionysius the Areopagite, mentioned *Acts* xvii. 34, but a man who lived in the third century. It also gives up the story of St. Philip, and of most of the pretended apostolic missionaries to Gaul. But it maintains the probability of Paul’s travelling over Gaul on his way to Spain; and of his sending Luke and Crescens to that country; and it affirms that in the second century, there were many flourishing churches in Gaul, besides those of Lyons and Vienne.

Dr. Mosheim (*De Rebus Christ. ante C. M.* p. 203, &c.) thinks neither of these opinions is fully confirmed in all its parts. The second, he gives up wholly. The third, he conceives, lacks evidence. Particularly, Paul’s journey to Spain, is itself questionable; and if admitted, there is no proof that he passed through Gaul. For St. Luke’s mission to Gaul, there is no evidence

broke the force of those falsehoods and contumelies, by which they were unjustly assailed, removed some obstacles to the progress of *Christ's* religion, and in this way contributed not a little to the enlargement of the church. For very many were prevented from embracing Christianity, solely by those detestable calumnies with which ungodly men aspersed it⁸. Another support to the Christian cause was furnished by the writers against the *heretics*. For the doctrines of these sects were so absurd, or so abominable, and the morals of some of them so disgraceful and impious, as to induce many to stand aloof from Christianity. But when they learned from the books against the heretics, that the true followers of *Christ* held these perverse men in abhorrence, their feelings towards them were changed.

§ 8. It is easier to conceive, than to express, how much the *miraculous powers* and the *extraordinary divine gifts*, which the Christians exercised on various occasions, contributed to extend the limits of the church. The gift of foreign tongues appears to have gradually ceased, as soon as many nations became enlightened with the truth, and numerous churches of Christians were every where established; for it became less necessary than it was at first. But the other gifts, with which God favoured the rising church of *Christ*, were, as we learn from numerous testimonies of the ancients, still conferred on particular persons here and there⁹.

⁸ ["Nothing more injurious can be conceived than the terms of contempt, indignation, and reproach, which the heathens employed in expressing their hatred against the Christians, who were called by them *atheists*, because they derided the heathen polytheism; *magicians*, because they wrought miracles; *self-murderers*, because they suffered martyrdom cheerfully for the truth; *haters of the light*, because, to avoid the fury of the persecutions raised against them, they were forced, at first, to hold their religious assemblies in the night; with a multitude of other ignominious epithets employed against them by Tacitus, Suetonius, Celsus, &c. See Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, book i. ch. ii. p. 5." *Macl.*]

⁹ Collections of these testimonies have been made, by Tob. Pfanner, *de Donis miraculosis*; and by W. Spencer, *Notes on Origen against Celsus*, p. 5, 6; but the most copious is by Mammachi, *Ori-*

gines et Antiquitates Christianae, tom. i. p. 363, &c. [The principal testimonies of the second and third centuries, are Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii. c. 6; *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 39 and 82; Irenaeus, l. ii. c. 31, and l. v. c. 6; and in Euseb. *H. E.* l. v. c. 7; Tertullian, *Apolog.* c. 23, 27, 32, 37; *ad Scap.* c. 2; Origen, *contra Cels.* l. i. p. 7, and l. vii. p. 334, ed. Spencer; Dionys. Alex. in Euseb. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 40; Minucius Felix, *Octav.* p. 361, ed. Paris, 1605; Cyprian, *de Idol. Vanit.* p. 14, *ad Demetrian.* p. 191, ed. Brem.—That what are called the *miraculous* gifts of the Holy Spirit, were liberally conferred, not only in this, but also in the following century, especially on those engaged in propagating the Gospel, all who are called Christians believe, on the unanimous and concordant testimony of the ancient writers. Nor do we, in my opinion, hereby incur any just charge of departing from sound reason. For, as these witnesses are all grave

§ 9. I wish that we were fully authorized to place among these miracles, what many ancient writers have recorded con-

men, fair and honest, some of them philosophers, men who lived in different countries, and relate not what they heard, but what they saw, call God to witness the truth of their declarations, (see Origen, *contra Celsam*, l. i. p. 35, ed. Spencer,) and do not claim for themselves, but attribute to others, these miraculous powers; what reason can there be for refusing to believe them? Yet a few years since, there appeared among the Britons, a man of no ordinary genius and learning, Conyers Middleton, who published a considerable volume, accusing the whole Christian world of credulity in this matter, and boldly pronouncing all that was said or written by the numerous ancients, concerning these extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit, to be false. See *A free Inquiry into the miraculous powers*, &c. London, 1749, 4to. The history of this famous book, and of the sharp contests it produced in England, may be learned from the British, French, and German literary journals, and from the German translation and refutation of the work which has been recently published. I shall here offer only a few observations on this, in many respects, most important subject. The apostolic age, the learned Middleton himself acknowledges to have been fruitful in miracles and extraordinary gifts. But he denies their continuance after the decease of the apostles; and concludes that whatever accounts exist of miracles in the second and third centuries, are the invention of crafty impostors, or the dreams of weak and deluded men. And he attributes great importance to this opinion, because the pretended miracles of the Romish saints rest on the same supports and arguments, as these miracles of the early ages; so that the former can never be disproved, if the latter be admitted. This looks honest, and worthy of a sound Christian man; for the divine origin of the Christian religion does not depend on the truth of the miracles reported to have been wrought in the second and third centuries, but is sufficiently proved, if it can be made evident that Christ and his apostles had power to suspend the laws of nature. But the discerning reader of the book will perceive, that the author has assailed the miracles of Christ and the apostles, by

his attack on those of subsequent date; and that he intended to weaken our confidence in all events which exceed the powers of nature. For, the objections he raises against the miracles of the second and third centuries, are of such a nature as to be readily applied to those of the first.—The substance of his eloquent and learned argumentation is this. All the writers of the three first centuries, whose works are extant, were ignorant of criticism, and not sufficiently guarded and cautious, but sometimes too credulous. Therefore all that they state concerning the miracles of their own times, and even of miracles which they saw with their own eyes, ought to be regarded as a fable. As if it were a conceded point, that no man, unless he is a good critic, can distinguish a true miracle from a false one; and, that he must always mistake and err, who sometimes yields his assent sooner than he ought. If this great man had only said, that some of the supernatural events which are reported to have happened in the early ages are very questionable, the position might be admitted: but to aim, by one such general argument, which is liable to innumerable exceptions, and destitute of a necessary and evident conclusiveness, to overthrow the united testimony of so many pious men, and men sufficiently cautious in other things; indicates, if I do not greatly mistake, a mind of high daring, and covertly plotting against religion itself. It is fortunate that this distinguished man, a little before his death, (for he died the last year [A. D. 1750,]) appears to have learned, from the arguments of his opposers, the weakness of his opinions. For in this last reply, published after his death, namely, *A Vindication of the free Inquiry*, &c. Lond. 1751, 4to, though he is here more contentious and contumacious than was proper, he plainly acknowledges himself vanquished, and surrenders the palm to his antagonists. For he says, he did not mean to affirm, that no miracles were wrought in the ancient Christian church, after the death of the apostles; on the contrary, he concedes, he says, that God did confirm the truth of Christianity, as occasion required, by repeated manifestations of his infinite power: all that he aimed to show, was, that the power of working

cerning a certain legion of Christians in the army of *Marcus Antoninus*, on his expedition against the Marcomanni¹, which by its supplications procured a shower of rain, when the Roman troops were ready to perish with thirst. But the reality of this miracle is a subject of controversy among the learned: and those who think the Christians to have misjudged in placing that sudden and unexpected shower, which saved the Roman army, among divine miracles, are supported, not only by very respectable authorities, but also by arguments of no little weight².

miracles constantly and perpetually was not exercised in the church after the apostolic age; and, therefore, that credit is not to be given to the statements of those ancient defenders of Christianity, who arrogate such a perpetual power: that is, if I can understand him,—among the doctors of the second and third centuries, there was not one that could work miracles *whenever he pleased*. But this is wholly changing the question. The learned author might have spared himself the labour of writing and defending his book, if this was all he intended when he commenced writing. For, so far as I know, it never came into the head of any Christian, to maintain that there were men among the Christians of the second, third, and fourth centuries, to whom God gave power to work miracles as often as they pleased, and of what kind they pleased, at all times, and in all places. *Bella geri placuit, nullos habitura triumphos.*—Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 221, &c.—Very candid remarks on this subject may also be found in Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. iv. p. 380, &c. and in Jortin's *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* vol. i. *passim.* Tr.] Tertullian “asserts, indeed, that Christians possessed the power of expelling demons, of curing diseases, of healing the wounds occasioned by the bites of serpents: but he casts a doubt upon the accuracy of his own statement by ascribing to Christians in general those extraordinary gifts, which, even in the days of the apostles, appear to have been confined to them, and to the disciples upon whom they laid their hands.” Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 96.

¹ A. D. 174. [Mosheim's language here, *de legione quantum Christianorum*, is, inaccurate. It might lead to a belief that the Roman army then contained a legion wholly Christian. “Yet

even Eusebius does but speak of the soldiers of the *Militiæ legion*, which is an ambiguous form of expression; while Tertullian uses the phrase, *Christianorum forte militum precationibus*,—*Christianorum militum orationibus*, no mention being made of a legion at all, and the word *forte* strongly opposing the idea of the Christians forming an entire body of troops.” (Newman's *Fleury*, i. cxvi.) An account of this matter is to be found in Eusebius, (*Ecl. Hist.* v. 5.) but it falls short of positive testimony. The historian merely gives the account as a thing reported. He says of it *λόγος ἔχει*, *the story has it*. He does, indeed, subsequently cite a lost work of Apollinaris, which asserted that the particular legion henceforth bore the designation of *the thundering*, by imperial order, to commemorate this great deliverance by its means. But a legion had borne that designation long before, indeed it seems so far back as the time of Augustus. *Ed.*]

² The arguments on the two sides of the question may be seen in Herm. Witsius, *Diss. de Legione fulminatrice*, subjoined to his *Ægyptiaca*; he defends the reality of the miracle; and Dam. Laroque, *Diss. de Legione fulminatrice*, subjoined to the *Adversaria Sacra* of his father Matth. Laroque, who opposes the idea of a miracle:—but best of all in the controversy concerning the miracle of the thundering legion, between Peter King [rather the Rev. Richard King, of Topsham; Tr.] and Walter Moyle, which I have translated into Latin, and published with notes, in my *Synagoga Dissertationum ad disciplinas sanctiores pertinentium*. See also P. E. Jablonski, *Spicilegium de Legione fulminatrice*; in the *Miscellan.* Lipsius, tom. viii. p. 417, where in particular, the reasons are investigated, which led the Christians improperly to class this

§ 10. It is certain, that the Roman army, when reduced to the greatest straits, was relieved by a sudden shower: and that this rain was regarded, both by the pagans and the Christians, as divinely sent and miraculous: the latter ascribed the unexpected favour to the operation of the people's prayers on *Christ*; while the former attributed it to Jupiter, or Mercury, or to magic. It is equally certain, I think, that many Christians were then serving in the Roman army. And who can doubt that these, on such an occasion, implored the compassion of their God and Saviour? Further, as the Christians of those times looked upon all extraordinary events as miracles, and ascribed every unusual and peculiar advantage enjoyed by the Romans to their own prayers, it is not strange, that the salvation of the Roman emperor and his army should be placed among the miracles which God wrought in answer to the prayers of Christians. But, as all wise men are now agreed, that no event is to be accounted a miracle, if it can be adequately accounted for on natural principles, or in the common and ordinary course of divine providence, and as this rain may be easily thus accounted for, it is obvious what judgment ought to be formed respecting it³.

§ 11. The *Jews* first under *Trajan*⁴, and afterwards under

rain among the miracles.—[See also Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 249, &c.—The most important among the ancient accounts of this matter are, on the side of the pagans, Dion Cassius, *Historia Romana*, lib. lxxi. c. 8; Julius Capitolinus, *Life of Marcus Antonin.* cap. 24; Ælius Lamprid. *Life of Hellogabalus*, cap. 9; Claudian, *Consulat.* vi. *Honorii* v.—and on the side of the Christians, Tertullian, *Apolog.* cap. 5; *ad Scapulam*, cap. 4; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. v. cap. 5; and *Chronicon*, p. 82, 215; Xiphilinus, on *Dion Cassius*, lib. lxxi. cap. 9, 10. *Tr.*]

³ ["That during the German war, the Roman army suffered severely from want of water, and was relieved from a situation of great peril by a seasonable shower of rain, is a fact which does not rest on the single authority of Tertullian:" (who not only asserts that this relief was procured by the prayers of the Christian soldiers, but also that the emperor hence protected Christians, and wrote a letter ascribing the rain to their

intercession.) "It is recorded by several profane writers, and confirmed by the indisputable testimony of the Antonine column. Nor was Tertullian singular in regarding the event as preternatural: the heathen historians did the same. But while Tertullian ascribes the deliverance of the emperor to the prayers of his Christian soldiers, Dion Cassius gives the credit of it to certain magical rites, performed by an Egyptian, named Arnuphis; and on the Antonine column it is attributed to the immediate interposition of Jupiter Pluvius. This latter circumstance completely disproves Tertullian's statement respecting the existence of a letter in which the emperor ascribed his deliverance to the prayers of his Christian soldiers: a statement, indeed, neither reconcileable with his general character, nor with the harsh treatment experienced by the Christians during his reign."—Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 107. *Ed.*]

⁴ A. D. 116.

*Adrian*⁵ led on by *Bar-Chochebas*, who pretended to be the Messiah, made insurrection against the Romans, and again suffered the greatest calamities. A vast number of them were put to death; and a new city, called *Ælia Capitolina*, was erected on the site of Jerusalem, which not an individual of their miserable race was allowed to enter⁶. This overthrow of the Jews confirmed, in some measure, the external tranquillity of the Christian community. For that turbulent nation had previously been every where the accusers of the Christians before the Roman judges; and in Palestine and the neighbouring regions, they had themselves inflicted great injuries upon them, because they refused to aid them in their opposition to the Romans⁷. This new calamity rendered it not so easy for them, as formerly, to do either of these things.

§ 12. The philosophers and learned men, who came over to the Christians in this century, were no inconsiderable protection and ornament to this holy religion, by their discussions, their writings, and their talents. But if any are disposed to question, whether the Christian cause received more benefit than injury from these men, I must confess myself unable to decide the point. For the noble simplicity and the majestic dignity of the Christian religion were lost, or at least impaired, when these philosophers presumed to associate their dogmas with it, and to bring faith and piety under the dominion of human-reason.

⁵ A. D. 132.

l. lxix. cap. 12—14. *Tr.*]

⁶ Justin Martyr, *Diad. cum Triumph.*
p. 49, 278. [Dion Cassius, *Hist. Rom.*

⁷ [Justin Martyr, *Apolog.* i. p. 72. *Schl.*]

CHAPTER II.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1, 2. The persecution of Trajan.—§ 3. That of Adrian.—§ 4. That of Antoninus Pius.—§ 5. That of Antoninus Philosophus.—§ 6. Its calamities.—§ 7. The reigns of Commodus and Severus.—§ 8. Calumnies against Christians.

§ 1. IN the beginning of this century there were no laws in force against the Christians; for those of *Nero* had been repealed by the senate, and those of *Domitian* by his successor *Nerva*¹. But it had become a common custom to persecute the Christians, and even to put them to death, as often as the pagan priests, or the populace under these men's instigation, demanded their destruction. Hence, under the reign of *Trajan*, otherwise a good prince, *popular tumults* were frequently raised in the cities against the Christians, which were fatal to many

¹ ["Gibbon also infers from Pliny's celebrated letter to Trajan, that when the former accepted the government of Bithynia, there were no general laws or decrees of the senate in force against the Christians, and that neither Trajan, nor any of his virtuous predecessors, whose edicts were received into the civil and criminal jurisprudence, had publicly declared their intentions concerning the new sect." If, however, we can attach any weight to the statements of Tertullian, the conclusions both of Gibbon and Mosheim are erroneous. In the first book, *ad Nations*, Tertullian expressly says, that while all the other edicts of Nero had been repealed, that against the Christians alone remained in force. In the *Apology*, after having stated that Nero and Domitian were the only emperors who had persecuted the Christians, he says, as we have already seen, that Marcus Antoninus became their protector in consequence of the miraculous deliverance of his army in the German expedition. Not, he adds, that the emperor abrogated the punishment enacted against them, but he indirectly did away

its effect by denouncing a heavier punishment against their accusers. What then, our author proceeds, are we to think of laws which none but the impious, the unjust, the vile, the cruel, the trifling, the insane enforce? of which Trajan partly frustrated the effect by forbidding all inquiries to be made after Christians? which neither Adrian, though a searcher out of all new and curious doctrines, nor Vespasian, though the conqueror of the Jews, nor Pius, nor Verus, called into action? The whole tenor of this passage manifestly assumes the existence of laws, which though generally allowed to slumber by the justice and humanity of the emperors, might yet at any moment be converted into instruments wherewith to injure and oppress the Christians. It is evident also from Pliny's letter and Trajan's answer, that the only offence laid to their charge by the informers was their religion; and that in the estimation both of the emperor and the proconsul, the mere profession of Christianity constituted a crime deserving punishment."—Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 117. *Ed.*]

of them². When such a tumult arose in Bithynia, where *Pliny* the younger was proprætor, he thought proper to apply to the emperor for instructions how to treat the Christians. The emperor wrote back that the Christians *were not to be sought after*; but being regularly accused and convicted, if they refused to return to the religion of their fathers, they were to be put to death as bad citizens³.

§ 2. This edict of *Trajan* being registered among the public laws of the Roman empire, set bounds indeed to the fury of the enemies of the Christians, but still it caused the destruction of many of them, even under the best of the emperors. For whenever any one had courage to face the danger of accusing, and the accused did not deny the charge, he might be delivered over to the executioner, unless he apostatized from Christianity. Thus by *Trajan's* law, perseverance in the Christian religion was a capital offence. Under this law, *Simeon*, the son of *Cleophas* and bishop of Jerusalem, a venerable old man, being accused by the Jews, suffered crucifixion⁴. According to the same law, *Trajan* himself ordered the great *Ignatius*, bishop of Antioch, to be thrown to wild beasts⁵. For the kind of death was left by the law to the pleasure of the judge.

§ 3. Still this law of *Trajan's* was a great restraint upon the priests, who were eager to oppress the Christians; because few persons were willing to assume the dangerous office of accusers. Under *Adrian*, therefore, who succeeded *Trajan*, A.D. 117, they weakened its force by an artifice. For they excited the populace, at the seasons of the public shows and games, to demand with united voice of the presidents and magistrates, the destruction of the Christians; and these public clamours could not be disregarded without danger of an insurrection⁶.

² Eusebius, *Historia Eccles.* lib. iii. cap. 32.

³ *Pliny*, *Epistol.* lib. x. Epist. 97, 98, which epistles many learned men have illustrated by their comments; and especially Vossius, Böhmer, Baldwin, and Heumann. [See Milner's *Hist. of the Ch. of Christ*, century ii. ch. i. *Tr.*]

⁴ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iii. cap. 32.

⁵ See the *Acta martyrii Ignatiani*, published by Ruinart, and in the *Patres Apostolici*, and elsewhere. [See

above, p. 98, note ⁴, and Milner's *Hist. of the Ch.* cent. ii. ch. i. p. 138. *Tr.*]

⁶ [It was an ancient custom or law of the Romans, of which many examples occur in their history, that the people, when assembled at the public games, whether at Rome or in the provinces, might demand what they pleased of the emperor or magistrates, which demands could not be rejected. This right, indeed, properly belonged only to Roman citizens, but it was gradually assumed and exercised by others, espe-

But *Serenus Granianus*, the proconsul of Asia, made representation to the emperor, that it was inhuman and unjust to immolate men convicted of no crime, at the pleasure of a furious mob. *Adrian*, therefore, sent a rescript to the presidents, which forbade the putting to death of Christians, unless they were accused in due form, and convicted of offence against the laws; *i.e.* as I apprehend, he re-instated the law of *Trajan*⁷. Perhaps also the *Apologies* for the Christians presented by *Quadratus* and *Aristides*, operated favourably on the emperor's mind⁸. In his reign, *Bar-Chochebas*, a pretended king of the Jews, before he was vanquished by *Adrian*, committed great outrages on the Christians, because they would not join his standard⁹.

§ 4. Under *Antoninus Pius*, the enemies of the Christians assailed them in a new manner; for, as they were, by the laws of *Adrian*, to be convicted of some *crime*, and some of the presidents would not allow this character to their religion merely, they were accused of impiety or *atheism*. This calumny was met by *Justin Martyr*, in an *Apology* presented to the emperor. And that prince himself afterwards decreed, that the Christians should be treated according to the law of *Adrian*¹. A little after, Asia Minor was visited with earthquakes; and the people, regarding the Christians as the cause of their calamities, rushed upon them with every species of violence and outrage. When informed of this, the emperor addressed an edict to the *Common Council of Asia*, denouncing capital punishment against

cially in the larger cities. Hence, when assembled at the public games, the populace could demand the destruction of all Christians, or of any individuals of them whom they pleased; and the magistrates dared not utterly refuse these demands.—Moreover, the abominable lives and doctrines of certain heretics of this age, brought odium on the whole Christian community; as we are expressly taught by *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iv. cap. 7.—See *Mosheim*, *de Rebb. Christ.* § c. p. 236. *Tr.*]

⁷ See *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 9, and *Fr. Baldwin*, *ad Edicta Principum in Christianos*, p. 73, &c. [This edict is also given by *Justin Martyr*, *Apology*. i. § 68, 69. It was addressed not only to *Minutius Fundanus*, the successor of *Serenus*, also but to the other governors

of provinces; as we learn from *Euseb.* *H. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 26. *Schl.*]

⁸ [These *Apologies* are mentioned by *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 3, and *Jerome*, *Epist. ad Magnum*, Opp. tom. iv. p. 656, ed. *Benedict*, and *de Viris Illustr.* c. 19, 20.—From this indulgence of the emperor towards the Christians, arose the suspicion that he himself inclined to their religion. *Lampridius*, *Vita Alexandri Severi*, cap. 43. *Schl.*]

⁹ *Justin Martyr*, *Apology*. ii. p. 72, ed. *Colon*. [*Jerome*, *de Viris Illustr.* cap. 21. *Schl.*]

¹ *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 26, [where *Melito* tells *Marcus Aurelius*, that his father (*Anton. Pius*) wrote to the *Larissians*, the *Thessalonians*, the *Athenians*, and to all the Greeks, not to molest the Christians. *Schl.*]

accusers of the Christians, if they could not convict them of some *crime*².

§ 5. *Marcus Antoninus*, the *philosopher*, whom most writers extol immoderately for his wisdom and virtue, did not indeed repeal this decree of his father, and the other laws of the preceding emperors; but he listened too much to the enemies of the Christians, and especially to the philosophers, who accused them of the most horrid crimes, and particularly of impiety, of Thyestean feasts, and Œdipodean incest. Hence no emperor, after the reign of *Nero*, caused greater evils and calamities to light on Christians than this eminently wise *Marcus Antoninus*; nor was there any emperor, under whom more *Apologies* for the Christians were drawn up, of which those by *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, and *Tatian* are still extant³.

§ 6. In the first place, this emperor issued unjust edicts against the Christians, whom he regarded as vain, obstinate,

² Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 13, [where the edict is given at length. It may also be seen in Milner, *Hist. of the Ch. cent. ii. ch. ii. vol. i. p. 158, &c. ed. Boston, 1822*, where several pious reflections are subjoined.—It has been questioned whether this edict was issued by Marcus Aurelius, or by his father Antoninus Pius. Valesius (on Euseb. *H. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 13) decides for the former; and Mosheim (*de Rebb. Christ. &c. p. 240, &c.*) is as decisive for the latter. Others have little doubt that the whole edict is a forgery of some early Christian. For this opinion they urge, that its language is not such as the pagan emperors uniformly use, but is plainly that of an eulogist of the Christians. See A. Neander's *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i. pt. i. page 151. *Tr.*—"After the death of Hadrian, A.D. 138, the efficacy of his edict against the attacks of popular fury passed away. There arose besides under the government of Antoninus Pius, public calamities, which excited afresh the rage of the populace, a famine, overflows of the Tiber, earthquakes in Asia Minor and Rhodes, and desolating fires in Rome, Antioch, and Carthage. The gentle and humane disposition of the emperor could not view with satisfaction these outbreakings of popular wrath, and in different rescripts addressed to the Greek states, he expressly condemned this violent conduct. But this emperor must have done even more for the

Christians, if a rescript, ascribed in all probability to him, and not to his successor, Marcus Aurelius, were genuine, the rescript to the council of Asia Minor, (*πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας*;) for he therein expressly declares, that the Christians should be punished only in case of their being convicted of political crimes; and on the contrary, any one who accused another simply on the ground of his being a Christian, should himself be liable to punishment. But the language of the rescript is rather that of a Christian than of a heathen emperor, especially of one whose peculiar praise was *insignis erga carcerum publicas cura ac religio*; and the history of consecutive times does not bespeak the existence of such an edict." (Rose's *Neander*, i. 100.) The rescript, as it stands in Eusebius, bears the name of Marcus Aurelius. *Ed.*]

³ [Dr. Mosheim, *de Rebb. Christ. &c. p. 244*, characterizes Marcus Antoninus as a well-disposed but superstitious man, a great scholar, but an indifferent emperor. His persecutions of the Christians arose from his negligence of business, his ignorance of the character of Christians and of Christianity, and from his easy credulity and acquiescence in the wishes of others.—His character is also given by Milner, *Hist. of the Church*, cent. ii. ch. iv. and very elaborately by A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. i. p. 154, &c. *Tr.*]

void of reason, ignorant of virtue⁴: yet the precise import of these edicts is not now known. In the next place, he allowed the judges, when Christians were accused of the crimes already specified, by slaves, and the vilest of persons, to put their prisoners to *torture*; and, notwithstanding their most constant denial of the charges alleged against them, to inflict on them capital punishments. For, as the laws would not allow the Christians to be executed without a crime, judges who wished them ill, were under the necessity of fixing some crime upon them by one way or other. Hence, under this emperor, not only were several very excellent men most unjustly put to death, (among whom were *Polycarp*, the pious bishop of Smyrna, and the celebrated philosopher *Justin*, surnamed *Martyr*⁵;) but also several Christian churches, and especially those of Lyons and Vienne in France, A.D. 177, were by his order nearly destroyed and obliterated, by various kinds of executions⁶.

§ 7. Under the reign of *Commodus*, his son⁷, if we except a few instances of suffering for the renunciation of paganism, no great calamity befel the Christians⁸. But when *Severus* was placed on the throne near the close of the century, much Christian blood was shed in Africa, Egypt, and other provinces. This is certain, from the testimonies of *Tertullian*⁹, *Clemens Alexandrinus*¹, and others; and those must mistake the fact

⁴ See Melito, as quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* l. iv. c. 26.

⁵ The *Acta Martyrii* of both Polycarp and Justin Martyr are published by Ruinart, in his *Acta Martyr. sincera*. [The former also, in the *Patres Apostol.* The life and martyrdom of Polycarp are the subject of the 5th chapter of Milner's *Hist. of the Ch. century ii.* vol. i. p. 178, &c. ed. Boston, 1822, as those of Justin Martyr are of ch. iii. of the same, p. 161, &c. *Tr.*]

⁶ See the Letter of the Christians at Lyons, giving account of this persecution, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. v. cap. 2. ["The Christians of Lyons and Vienne appear to have been a religious colony from Asia Minor, or Phrygia, and to have maintained a close correspondence with those distant communities." (Milman's *Hist. of Christianity*, ii. 193.) "The fanatical rage of the people in these cities resembled, if it did not exceed, that of the people of Smyrna, and there was here also the additional circumstance, that the superior officers

of government were infected with this fury." (Rose's *Neander*, i. 110.) The most illustrious victim was Pothinus, bishop of Lyons, a man of ninety, sinking under infirmity and sickness, but whose pious energy was unsurpassable, when dragged before the tribunal. He was not, however, formally put to death in this persecution. After being beaten, and used in the most violent manner, he was cast into prison, where he died in the course of two days. *Ed.*]

⁷ A.D. 180—192.

⁸ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. v. cap. 24, and 16. 18, 19.

⁹ [Tertullian, *ad Scapulam*, cap. 4, and *Apologet.* cap. 5, which show that Severus himself was, at first, favourable to the Christians. But the same *Apologet.* cap. 35. 49. 7. 12. 30. 37. shows that Christians suffered before the enactment of the laws. *Schl.*]

¹ [Clemens Alex. *Stromat.* l. ii. p. 494. *Schl.*—See also the account of the martyrs of Scillita in Africa, A.D. 200, in Ruinart's *Acta Martyr.* Baronius, *Ann.*

who say, that the Christians enjoyed peace under *Severus*, up to the time when he enacted laws that exposed them to the loss of life and property, which was in the beginning of the next century. For, as the laws of the [former] emperors were not abrogated, and among these, the edicts of *Trajan* and *Marcus Antoninus* were very unjust; it was in the power of the presidents to persecute the Christians with impunity whenever they pleased. These calamities of the Christians, near the end of this century, induced *Tertullian* to compose his *Apologeticum* and some other works².

§ 8. It will appear less unaccountable, that so holy a people as the Christians should suffer so much persecution, if it be considered, that the patrons of the ancient superstition continually assailed them with their railings, calumnies, and libels. Their reproaches and calumnies, of which we have before spoken, are recounted by the writers of the Apologies. The Christians were attacked, in a book written expressly against them, by *Celsus*, the philosopher; whom *Origen*, in his confutation of him, represents as an Epicurean, but whom we, for substantial reasons, believe to have been a Platonist of the sect of *Ammonius*³. This miserable caviller deals in slander, as *Origen's* answer to him shows. And he does not so much attack the Christians, as play off his wit, which is not distinguished for elegance and refinement. *Fronto*, the rhetorician, also made some attempts against the Christians; but these have perished, with the exception of a bare mention of them by *Minutius Felix*⁴. To these may be added *Crescens*, a Cynic

A.D. 200, and Milner, *Hist. of the Ch.* vol. i. p. 236. *Tr.*]

² I have expressly treated of this subject in my *Diss. de vera atate Apologetici Tertulliani et initio persecutionis Seceri*; which is the first essay in my *Synagma Diss. ad hist. eccles. pertinent.*

³ [See Mosheim's preface to the German translation of Origen's work. *Tr.*—"The learned Dr. Lardner does not think it possible that Celsus could have been of the sect of Ammonius; since the former lived and wrote in the second century, whereas the latter did not flourish before the third. And, indeed, we have from Origen himself, that he knew of two only of the name of Celsus, one who lived in the time of Nero, and the other in the reign of Adrian and afterwards. The latter

was the philosopher, who wrote against Christianity." *Macl.*]

⁴ Minutius Felix, *Octavius*, p. 266, ed. Herald.—[Minucius mentions this calumniator in two passages, namely, chap. 10, p. 99, and chap. 31, p. 322; in the former of which, he calls him *Cirtensis noster*; implying, that he was of Cirta, in Africa: in the latter passage, he speaks of him as an *orator*, indicating what profession he followed. It has been supposed by the learned, and not without reason, that this *Fronto* was Cornelius *Fronto*, the rhetorician, who instructed *Marcus Antoninus* in eloquence (and whose works were first published A.D. 1816, by Aug. Maïus, Frankf. on Mayn, in 2 parts). So long as the Christian community was made up of unlearned persons, the philoso-

philosopher, who, though he seems to have written nothing against the Christians, yet was very eager to do them harm; and in particular did not cease to persecute *Justin Martyr*, till he compassed his death ⁵.

phers despised them. But when, in the second century, some eminent philosophers became Christians, as Justin, Athenagoras, Pantænus, and others, who retained the name, garb, and mode of living of philosophers, and who became teachers of youth, and while they gave a philosophical aspect to Christianity, exposed the vanity of the pagan philosophy, and the shameless lives of those addicted to it; the pagan philosophers perceiving their reputations and their interests to be at stake, now joined the populace and the priests in persecuting the Christians in general; and they especially assailed the Christian philosophers, with their calumnies and

accusations. Their chief motive was not the love of truth, but their own reputation, influence, glory, worldly interest and advantage; just the same causes as had before moved the pagan priests. This war of the philosophers commenced in the reign of Marcus Antoninus, who was himself addicted to philosophy. And it is easy to see what induced him to listen to his brother philosophers, and, at their instigation, to allow the Christians to be persecuted. See Mosheim, *de Rebb. Christ.* &c. p. 256, &c. *Tr.*]

⁵ Justin Martyr, *Apologia* ii. p. 21, ed. Oxon. Tatian, *Orat. contra Græcos*, p. 72, ed. Worthii.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. State of learning in general.—§ 2, 3. Learned men.—§ 4. Rise of the new Platonics.—§ 5. Eclectics at Alexandria.—§ 6. Approved by the Christians.—§ 7. Ammonius Saccas.—§ 8. His fundamental principles.—§ 9. His principal doctrines.—§ 10. His austere system of moral discipline.—§ 11. His opinions concerning God and Christ.—§ 12. All effects of this philosophy on Christianity.—§ 13. The state of learning among Christians.

§ 1. LITERATURE, although it seemed in some measure to recover its former dignity and lustre during the reign of *Trajan*¹, could not long retain its influence under the subsequent emperors, who were indisposed to patronize it. The most learned among these Roman sovereigns, *Marcus Antoninus*, showed favour only to the philosophers, and especially to the Stoics; the other arts and sciences he, like the Stoics, held in contempt². Hence the literary productions of this age, among the Romans, are far inferior to those of the preceding century, in elegance, brilliance, and good taste.

§ 2. Yet there were men of excellent genius, among both Greeks and Romans, who wrote well on almost every branch of learning then cultivated. Among the Greeks, *Plutarch* was particularly eminent. He was a man of various but ill-digested learning; and besides was tainted with the principles of the academics. Rhetoricians, logicians, and grammarians had schools in all the more considerable towns of the Roman

¹ Pliny, *Epistolar.* lib. iii. Ep. 18, p. 234, 235, ed. Cortii et Longolii.

² M. Antoninus, *Meditations*, or *Ad se*

ipsum, lib. i. § 7, p. 3, 4, § 17, p. 17, ed. Lips.

empire; in which they pretended to train up youth for public life, by various exercises and declamations. But those educated in these schools were vain, loquacious, and formed for display, rather than truly eloquent, wise, and competent to transact business. Hence the sober and considerate looked with contempt on the education acquired under these teachers. There were two public academies; one at *Rome*, founded by *Adrian*, in which all branches of learning were taught, but especially jurisprudence; the other at *Berytus*, in Phœnicia, in which jurists were principally educated³.

§ 3. Many philosophers, of all the different sects, flourished at this time; but to enumerate them belongs rather to other works than to this⁴. The Stoic sect had the honour of embracing two great men, *Marcus Antoninus*, the emperor, and *Epictetus*⁵. But each of these had more admirers than disciples and followers; nor do the Stoics appear from books to have stood very high among philosophers in this age. There were larger numbers in the schools of the Platonists; among other reasons, because they were less austere, and their doctrines accorded better with the prevailing opinions of the gods. But no sect appears to have numbered more adherents than the Epicureans; whose precepts led to an indulgent, careless, and voluptuous life⁶.

§ 4. Near the close of this century a new philosophic body suddenly started up, which in a short time prevailed over a large part of the Roman empire, and not only nearly swallowed up the other sects, but likewise did immense injury to Christianity⁷. Egypt was its birth-place, and particularly Alexandria, which for a long time had been the seat of literature and every science. Its followers chose to be called *Platonics*. Yet they did not follow *Plato* implicitly, but collected from all systems whatever seemed to coincide with their own views.

³ *M. Antoninus, Meditations*, or, *Ad se ipsum*, lib. i. § 7. 10. 17, p. 4. 7. 16, ed. Lips.

⁴ Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Trypho*. Opp. p. 218, &c. Many of the philosophers of this age are mentioned by *M. Antoninus, Meditat.* or, *Ad se ipsum*, lib. i.

⁵ [Concerning *M. Antoninus*, see Brucker's *Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 578, and for *Epictetus*, *ibid.* p. 568. *Schl.*—Stæudlin, *Gesch. der Moral Phi-*

los. p. 265, &c. treats of *M. Antoninus*; and *ibid.* p. 260, &c. of *Epictetus*. *Tr.*]

⁶ Lucian, *Pseudomantis*; Opp. tom. i. p. 763.

⁷ [See Dr. Mosheim's *Commentat. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia*, in his *Syntagma Diss. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinent.* vol. i. p. 85, &c.; and Brucker's *Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 162, &c. *Schl.*—And, on the contrary, C. A. T. Keil, *Exercitatt.* xviii. *de Doctoribus veteris eccles.*

And the ground of this preference for the name of *Platonics* was, that they conceived *Plato* to have understood more correctly than any one besides, that most important branch of philosophy, which treats of God, and things remote from sensible apprehension.

§ 5. That controversial spirit in philosophy, which exacted from disciples implicit acquiescence in the decisions of a single master, was now disapproved by the more wise. Hence among lovers of truth, and men of moderation, a new class of philosophers had grown up in Egypt, who avoided altercation and a sectarian spirit, and who professed simply to follow the truth, gathering up whatever was accordant with it, in all the philosophic schools. They assumed therefore the name of *Eclectics*. But, notwithstanding these philosophers were really the partisans of no sect, yet it appears, from a variety of testimonies, that they much preferred *Plato*, and embraced most of his dogmas concerning God, the human soul, and the universe⁸.

§ 6. This philosophy was adopted by such of the learned at Alexandria, as wished to be accounted Christians, and yet to retain the name, the garb, and the rank of philosophers. In particular, all those who in this century presided in the schools of the Christians at Alexandria, *Athenagoras*, *Pantænus*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, are said to have approved of it⁹. These men were persuaded that true philosophy, the great and most salutary gift of God, lay in scattered fragments among all the sects of philosophers; and therefore, that it was the duty of every wise man, and especially of a Christian teacher, to collect those fragments from all quarters, and to use them for the defence of religion and the confutation of impiety. Yet this selection of opinions did not prevent them from regarding

culpi corruptæ per Platonicas sententias theologia, liberandis, Lips. 1793—1807, 4to. Tr.]

⁸ [See Brucker's *Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 189, &c. *Schl.*]

⁹ The title and dignity of philosopher so much delighted those good men, that, when made presbyters, they would not abandon the philosopher's cloak and dress. See Origen's letter to Eusebius, *Opp.* tom. i. p. 2, ed. de la Rue. [Justin Martyr, *Diad. cum Trypho. initium*. For proof that Pantænus studied philosophy, see Origen, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* l. vi. c. 19. Jerome, *de Scripturibus Il-*

lustr. cap. 20. The proficiency of Athenagoras in philosophy appears from his *Apology*, and his *Essay on the Resurrection*. That Clemens Alex. was much addicted to philosophy, is very evident; see his *Stromata*, passim. — Concerning the Alexandrian Christian school, see Herm. Conringius, *Antiquitates Academicæ*, p. 29. J. A. Schmidt, Diss. prefixed to A. Hyperii *Libellus de Catechesi*: Domin. Aulsius, *delle Scuole Sacre*, lib. ii. cap. 1, 2. 21. Geo. Langemäck, *Historia Catechismorum*, pt. i. p. 86. — See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 273, &c. Tr.]

Plato as wiser than all the rest, and as especially remarkable for treating the Deity, the soul, and things remote from sense, so as to suit the Christian scheme¹.

§ 7. This [eclectic] mode of philosophising received some modification, when *Ammonius Saccas*, at the close of the century, with great applause, opened a school at Alexandria, and laid the foundation of that sect which is called the *New Platonic*. This man was born and educated a Christian, and perhaps made pretensions to Christianity all his life². Being possessed of great fecundity of genius as well as eloquence, he undertook to bring all systems of philosophy and religion into harmony, or attempted to teach a philosophy, by which all philosophers, and the men of all religions, the Christian not excepted, might be joined into one concordant body. And here, especially, lies the difference between this new sect and the *eclectic* philosophy which had before flourished in Egypt. For the *Eclectics* held that there was a mixture of good and bad,

¹ [This cultivation of philosophy by Christian teachers greatly displeased those who were attached to the ancient simple faith, as taught by Christ and his apostles; for they feared, what afterwards actually happened, that the purity and excellence of divine truth would suffer by it. Hence the Christians were divided into two parties, the friends of philosophy and human learning, and the opposers of them. The issue of the long contest between them was, that the advocates of philosophy prevailed.—Traces of this controversy may be seen in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. v. c. 26, and in Clemens Alex. *Stromat.* lib. i. cap. 1—5.—See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ. ante Constant.* M. p. 276, &c. Tr.]

² [The history of the philosopher Ammonius is involved in great obscurity. All that could be gathered from antiquity respecting him, is given by Brucker, *Historia Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 205. See also J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, lib. iv. c. 26. Whether Ammonius continued a professed Christian, or apostatized, has been much debated. Porphyry, who studied under Plotinus, a disciple of Ammonius, (as quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vi. c. 19,) says, that he was born of Christian parents, but when he came to mature years, embraced the religion of the laws; i. e. the pagan religion. Eusebius taxes Porphyry with falsehood in this; and

says, that Ammonius continued a Christian, till his death, as appears from his books, one of which was on the accordance of Moses with Jesus Christ. Jerome, *de Scriptoribus Illustr.* cap. 55, says nearly the same. Valesius, Bayle, Basnage, and Dr. Mosheim, (when he wrote his essay *de Ecclesia turbata per recentiores Platonicos*,) agreed with Eusebius and Jerome. But Dr. Mosheim, when he wrote his *Commentarii de Rebus Christ.* fell in with the opinion of Fabricius, Brucker, and others, (and which is now the general opinion,) that Eusebius and Jerome confounded Ammonius the philosopher with another Ammonius, the reputed author of a harmony of the Gospels, and other works; because it can hardly be supposed this enthusiastic admirer of philosophy would have found time or inclination for composing such books. Besides, it is said, Ammonius the philosopher published no books. Still the question remains, what were the religious character and creed of this philosopher in his maturer years? Dr. Mosheim thinks it probable he did not openly renounce Christianity, but endeavoured to accommodate himself to the feelings of all parties; and, therefore, he was claimed by both pagans and Christians. Hence, if he *was* a Christian, he was a very inconsistent one, and did much injury to its cause.—See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 281. Tr.]

true and false, in all the systems; and therefore they selected out of all what appeared to them consonant with reason, and rejected the rest. But *Ammonius* held that all sects professed one and the same system of truth, with only some difference in the mode of stating it, and some minute difference in their conceptions; so that by means of suitable explanations, they might with little difficulty be brought into one body³. He moreover held this new and singular principle, that the prevailing religions, and the Christian also, must be understood and explained according to this common philosophy of all the sects, and that not only the fables of the vulgar pagans and their priests, but also the interpretations of the disciples of *Christ*, ought to be separated from their respective religions.

§ 8. The grand object of *Ammonius*, to bring all sects and religions into harmony, required him to do much violence to the sentiments and opinions of all parties, philosophers, priests, and Christians, and particularly by allegorical interpretations, to remove very many impediments out of his way. The manner in which he prosecuted his object, appears in the writings of his disciples and adherents, which have come down to us in great abundance. To make the arduous work more easy, he assumed, that philosophy was first produced and nurtured among the people of the East; that it was inculcated among the Egyptians by *Hermes*⁴, and thence passed to the Greeks; that it was a little obscured and deformed by the disputatious Greeks; but still, that by *Plato*, the best interpreter of the principles of *Hermes* and of the ancient oriental sages, it was preserved for the most part entire and unsullied⁵: that the religions received by the various nations of the world were not inconsistent with this most ancient philosophy; yet it had most unfortunately happened, that what the ancients taught by symbols and fictitious histories, according to the oriental fashion, had been understood literally by the people and the priests; and thus the ministers of Divine Providence, those *demons* whom the supreme Lord of all had placed over the various parts of

³ [The views of this sect are very clearly expressed by *Julian*, who was a great devotee of this philosophy, *Orat. vi. contra Cynicos*, *Opp.* p. 164. *Schl.*]

⁴ [This appears from the writings of all his followers, *Plotinus*, *Proclus*, *Porphyry*, *Damascius*, and others. And the

learned, not without reason, conjecture that all the works of *Hermes* and *Zoroaster*, which we now have, originated in the schools of these New Platonics. *Schl.*]

⁵ [*Jamblichus*, *de Mysteriis Ægyptiorum*, l. i. c. 1, 2. *Schl.*]

our world, had erroneously been converted into gods, and had been worshipped with many vain ceremonies; that, therefore, the public religions of all nations should be corrected by this ancient philosophy; and that it was the sole object of *Christ* to set bounds to the reigning superstition, and correct the errors which had crept into religion, but not to abolish altogether the ancient religions⁶.

§ 9. To these assumptions he added the common doctrines of the Egyptians, (among whom he was born and educated,) concerning the universe and the Deity, as constituting *one great whole* [*Pantheism*]; concerning the eternity of the world, the nature of the soul, providence, and the government of this world by demons, and other received doctrines, all of which he considered as true and not to be called in question. For it is most evident that the ancient philosophy of the Egyptians, which they pretended to have learned from Hermes, was the *basis* of the New Platonic or Ammonian; and the book of Jamblichus, *de Mysteriorum Egyptiorum*, in particular, shows this to be the case. In the next place, with these Egyptian notions, he united the philosophy of *Plato*; which could be done with little difficulty, by distorting some of the principles of Plato, and putting a false construction on his language⁷. Finally, the dogmas of the other sects he construed, as far as was possible, by means of art, ingenuity, and the aid of allegories, into apparent coincidence with Egyptian and Platonic principles.

§ 10. To these Egyptiaco-Platonic philosophy, this ingenious

⁶ [The practical operation of this principle appears in that compromise with paganism which distinguishes the Romish church. But although Romanists have borrowed many usages, and some opinions (purgatory for instance), from pagans, they have not contented themselves within the limits prescribed by Ammonius. Their saints, to whom are assigned peculiar offices over men and their affairs, really receive much of the honours which were considered as erroneously given to the corresponding demons (δαμονες) of Gentilism. *Ed.*]

⁷ [On this principle the whole philosophy of the ancient Egyptians was founded; and on it Ammonius erected his system. The book which goes under the title of *Hermæ Trismegisti Sermo de Natura Deorum, ad Asclepium*, which is

extant in Latin among the works of Apuleius, the supposed translator, is evidence of this fact. See also Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangel.* lib. iii. c. 9, and Mosheim's notes on Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, tom. i. p. 404, &c. And the same fundamental principle is assumed by Plotinus, Proclus, Simplicius, Jamblichus, and all the New Platonists. See, for example, Porphyry, in his *Life of Plotinus*, cap. 2, p. 94. *Schl.*]

⁸ [The principle of the Ammonian and Egyptian philosophy, that God and the world constitute *one indivisible whole*, it cost him much labour to reduce to harmony with the system of Plato; who, as we learn from his *Timæus*, taught the external existence of matter, as a substance distinct from God. See Proclus on the *Timæus* of Plato. *Schl.*]

man and fanatic joined a system of moral discipline apparently of high sanctity and austerity. He, indeed, permitted the common people to live according to the laws of their country, and the dictates of nature; but he directed the wise, by means of contemplation, to raise their souls, which sprang from God himself, above all earthly things, at the same time weakening and emaciating the body, which is hostile to the spirit's liberty, by means of hunger, thirst, labour, and other austerities⁹. Thus they might, even in the present life, attain to communion with the Supreme Being, and ascend, after death, active and unencumbered, to the universal Parent, and be for ever united with him. And these precepts, *Ammonius*, like one born and educated among Christians, was accustomed to embellish and express by forms of expression borrowed from the sacred Scriptures, which has caused such language to occur abundantly in the writings of his followers¹. With his austere discipline he connected the art of so purging that faculty of mind which receives the images of things, as to make it fit for seeing demons, and for performing many wonderful feats by their assistance. His followers called this art *Theurgy*². It was not, however, cultivated by all the philosophers of his school, but only by the more eminent³.

§ 11. That the prevailing religions, and particularly the Christian, might not appear irreconcilable with his system, *Ammonius* first turned the whole history of the pagan gods into

⁹ [See Porphyry, *de Abstinencia*, lib. i. c. 27, &c. p. 22—34. *Schl.*]

¹ [See examples in Hierocles, on the *Golden Verses* of Pythagoras; and in Simplicius and Jamblichus. See also Mosheim's *Diss. de Studio Ethnicorum Christianos imitandi*, in vol. i. of his *Diss. ad Hist. Ecclcs. pertinent.* p. 321. *Schl.*]

² [This worthless science is very similar to what has been called *allowable magic*, and which is distinguished from necromancy, or unlawful magic. It was undoubtedly of Egyptian origin. As the Egyptians imagined the whole world to be full of good and evil spirits, they might easily be led to suppose that there must be some way to secure the favour of these demons. See Augustine, *de Cit. Dei*, l. x. c. 9. Opp. tom. ix. p. 187. *Schl.*—“*Theurgy* is the science of the gods and the various classes of su-

perior spirits, of their appearing to men, and their operations; and the art, by certain acts, habits, words, and symbols, of moving the gods to impart to men secrets which surpass the powers of reason, to lay open the future to them, and become visible to them. This *theurgy*, which goes farther, and rises higher than *philosophy*, was first imparted and revealed to men by the gods themselves, in ancient times, and afterwards preserved among the priests. So it is described in the book which bears the name of Jamblichus, *de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum*, lib. i. c. 26—29.” Staeudlin, *Geschichte der Moralphilosophie*, p. 462. *Tr.*]

³ [See concerning the moral system of the new Platonics, in all its material parts, Staeudlin, *Geschichte der Moralphilosophie*, p. 435, &c. *Tr.*]

allegory⁴, and maintained that those, whom the vulgar and the priests honoured with the title of *Gods*, were only the *ministers* of God, to whom some homage might and should be paid, yet short of the superior homage which was due to the Supreme God⁵; and then he acknowledged that *Christ* was an extraordinary man, the friend of God, and an admirable *Theurge*⁶. But he denied that *Christ* aimed wholly to suppress the worship of demons, ministers as they were of Divine Providence; his real object only being to wipe away the stains contracted by the ancient religions⁷: but he charged his disciples with corrupting and vitiating the system of their master⁸.

§ 12. This new species of philosophy, imprudently adopted by *Origen* and other Christians, did immense harm to Christianity. For it led the teachers of it to involve in philosophic obscurity many parts of our religion, which were in themselves plain and easy to be understood; and to add to the precepts of the Saviour no few things, of which not a word can be found in the holy Scriptures. It also produced for us that gloomy set of men called *mystics*, whose system, if divested of its Pla-

⁴ [See, for example, Porphyry, *de Agtro Nymphar.* apud Homerum, *de Styge*, &c. *Schl.*]

⁵ [Paul Orosius, *Historia*, lib. vi. cap. l. p. 364, 365. *Schl.*]

⁶ [It cannot be denied that the sect of Ammonius embraced some, who were enemies of Christ and the Christians. The emperor Julian, and some others, are proof of this. But Ammonius himself honoured Christ. And Augustine contended against some philosophers of his time, who, as followers of Ammonius, honoured Christ, yet maintained that the Christians had corrupted his doctrine; *de Consensu Evangelistarum*, Opp. tom. iii. pt. ii. lib. i. c. 6, § 11, p. 5, and c. 8, § 14, p. 6, and c. 15, p. 8. *Schl.*]

⁷ [Augustine, *de Consensu Evangel.* lib. i. c. 16, p. 8, and c. 24, p. 18. Yet they admitted that Christ abolished the worship of certain demons of an inferior order, and enjoined upon men to pray to the celestial gods, and especially to the Supreme God. This is evident from a passage of Porphyry, quoted by Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, lib. xix. c. 23, § 4, Opp. tom. vii. p. 430. *Schl.*—This principle applies directly to the saint-worship of Romanists. The better informed

among them keep within the bounds which Ammonius approved, the less informed naturally fall into the excesses which he pronounced blemishes of the pagan system. *Edl.*]

⁸ What we have stated in these sections respecting the doctrines of Ammonius, we have collected from the books and discussions of his followers, who are called *New Platonics*. Ammonius himself left no writings; and he forbid his followers ever publishing his doctrines, but they did not obey him. See Porphyry, *Vita Plotini*, cap. iii. p. 97, ed. Fabricii, lib. iv. *Biblioth. Græca*. Yet there can be no doubt, that all we have stated was invented by Ammonius himself, whom the whole family of the New Platonics constantly affirm to have been the author of their philosophy.—[Dr. Mosheim, in his *Commentarij de Robus Christ. ante Constantin. M.* § 27—32, p. 280—298, has given a more full account of Ammonius and his doctrines, and has cited, particularly, his chief authorities; but the substance of his statements is contained in the preceding sections, and his most important authorities are referred to in the notes of Schlegel, which are all here preserved. *Tr.*]

tonic notions respecting the origin and nature of the soul, will be a lifeless and senseless corpse. It laid a foundation, too, for that indolent mode of life which was afterwards adopted by many, and particularly by numerous tribes of *monks*; and it recommended to Christians various foolish and useless rites, suited only to nourish superstition, no small part of which we see religiously observed by many even to the present day. And finally it alienated the minds of many, in the following centuries, from Christianity itself, and produced a heterogeneous species of religion, consisting of Christian and Platonic principles combined. And who is able to enumerate all the evils and injurious changes which arose from this new philosophy—or, if you please, from this attempt to reconcile true and false religions with each other?

§ 13. The number of learned men among the Christians, which was small in the preceding century, was larger in this. And yet we scarcely find among them any skilled in rhetoric, dialectics, and eloquence. Most of those, who obtained some reputation among them by their learning, were philosophers; and they, as before stated, followed the principles of the *Eclectics*, and gave *Plato* preference to others. But all Christians were not agreed as to the utility of philosophy and literature. Those who were themselves initiated into the depths of philosophy, wished that many, and especially such as aspired to the office of bishops and teachers, might apply themselves to the study of human wisdom, for the purpose of enabling them to confute enemies of the truth with more effect, and of rendering them better fitted for the guidance and instruction of others. But a great majority thought otherwise; they wished to banish all reasoning and philosophy out of the confines of the church; for they feared that learning might injure piety⁹. At this time, therefore, broke out that unhappy war between *faith* and *reason*, *religion* and *philosophy*, *piety* and *intelligence*, which

⁹ [That philosophy has injured enormously genuine Christianity, will be readily conceded by all who rest faith solely upon the rock of Scripture. When such persons are asked to account for the existence of religious principles and usages, which are incapable of proof from the sacred volume, and even seem at variance with it, they have only to cite the semi-Christian school of philosophy, which arose at Alexandria be-

fore the second century closed. Scarcely any of the fathers are as ancient; and, therefore, matter in their works which is often referred to apostolical tradition, must at least be quite as likely to have come from early attempts to amalgamate scriptural truth with philosophy. If such matter have a palpable affinity with paganism, the philosophers must, indeed, have a better claim to the introduction of it than the apostles. *Ed.*]

has been protracted through all succeeding centuries, down to our own times, and which we by all our efforts cannot easily bring to an end. By degrees, those obtained the ascendancy who thought that philosophy and erudition were profitable, rather than hurtful, to religion and piety; and laws were at length established, that no person entirely illiterate and unlearned should be admitted to the office of teacher in the church. Yet the vices of the philosophers and learned men, among other causes, prevented the opposite party from ever being destitute of patrons and advocates. Ample proof of this will be found in the history of the following centuries.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS, AND OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

- § 1. The form of church government.—§ 2. Union of churches in a province. Origin of councils.—§ 3. Their too great authority gave rise to metropolitans and patriarchs.—§ 4. Parallel between the Jewish and Christian priesthood.—§ 5. The principal writers.

§ 1. THE form of church government, which began to exist in the preceding century, was in this, more industriously established and confirmed in all its parts. One president, or *bishop*, presided over each church. He was created by the common suffrage of the whole people. With the *presbyters* for his council, whose number was not fixed, he watched over the interests of religion, and assigned to each *presbyter* his station. Subject to both bishop and presbyters were the servants or *deacons*, who were divided into certain classes, because all those duties which management of Christian affairs required, could not well be discharged by them indiscriminately.

§ 2. During a great part of this century, all the churches continued to be, as at first, *independent* of each other, or were connected by no consociations or confederations¹. Each church

¹ Yet by ancient custom, peculiar respect was paid to the churches founded and governed by the apostles themselves; and such churches were appealed to in

was a kind of little state, governed by its own laws, which were enacted, or at least sanctioned, by the people. But by degrees, all the Christian churches within the same province united, and formed a sort of larger society, or commonwealth, which, as is usual with confederated republics, held its conventions at stated seasons, and in them deliberated for the common advantage of the whole confederation. This custom first arose among the Greeks, with whom such confederations of several cities, and the consequent conventions of their delegates, had long been in use. In process of time, when experience had shown its utility, this practice found its way over all the Christian church². These conventions, in which delegates from several churches assembled for deliberation, were called by the

controversies on points of doctrine, as most likely to know what the apostles had taught. See Irenæus, *adv. Hæres.* lib. iii. c. 3, and Tertullian, *de Præscript. adv. Hæres.* c. 36. Thus, Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 258. Tr.—For additional information, see Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 236. *Ed.*]

² Tertullian, *de Jejunii*, c. 13, p. 711, [where we have this very important statement: *Ajuntur præterea per Græcias, illa certis in locis Concilia ex universis ecclesiis, per quæ et altiora quæque in commune tractantur, et ipsa representatio totius nominis Christiani magnâ veneratione celebratur.* From this passage of Tertullian, which was written near the beginning of the third century, Dr. Mosheim (*de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 266, &c.) infers, 1. that provincial councils had not then been held in Africa, nor any where except among the Greeks; 2. that councils were considered as human institutions, and as acting only by human authority. 3. That the provincial councils were held always in the same places—*certis in locis*;—4. that they did not interfere with the private concerns of individual churches, which were left to their own management; but conferred only on greater matters, or such as were of common interest—*altiora*—*tractantur*; 5. that the attending bishops acted as representatives of their churches, and not as men clothed with authority from heaven, by virtue of their office—*representatio totius nominis Christiani*. From Greece, the custom of meeting in councils extended into Syria and Pales-

tine. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* l. v. c. 23. We have no certain accounts of any councils till after the middle of the second century. The earliest of which we have authentic notice, were those which deliberated concerning the Montanists, about A.D. 170 or 173, (Euseb. *II. E.* v. 16,) and the next were those assembled to consider the proper time for Easter. (Euseb. *II. E.* v. 23.) All these councils are placed by Eusebius, under the reign of Commodus, or A.D. 180—192. In the third century, councils became frequent. Provincial councils were now held, perhaps throughout the Christian world; and special councils were called as occasion required. Originally these councils had no jurisdiction; but were mere conventions of delegates, met to consider and agree upon matters of common concernment. But they soon began to claim power, to enact and enforce laws, and to hear and decide controversies. And the bishops, instead of appearing as the representatives of their churches, claimed authority from Christ, to bind and control the churches. See W. C. Ziegler, on the origin of Synods, in Henkens, *Neuen Magazin*, Band i. St. i. G. J. Planck's *Geschichte der christl. kirchl. Gesellschafts-Verfassung*, period ii. ch. v. vol. i. p. 90, &c. C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Kirchenversamml.* Introd. § 3, 4, and b. i. ch. i. sect. ii. p. 82, &c. ch. ii. p. 118, &c.—Jos. Bingham, *Origines Eccles.* vol. vii. p. 45, &c. and Sir P. King, *Constitution, &c. of the Prim. Church*, ch. 8. Tr.]

Greeks *Synods*, and by the Latins *Councils*; and the laws agreed upon in them were called *canons*, that is, *rules*.

§ 3. These councils, of which no vestige appears before the middle of this century, changed nearly the whole form of the church. For in the first place, the ancient rights and privileges of the people were, by them, very much abridged; and on the other hand, the authority and dignity of the bishops were not a little augmented. At first, they did not deny themselves to be the representatives of their churches, and guided by instructions from the people; but gradually they made higher pretensions, maintaining that power was given them by *Christ* himself, to decide upon rules of faith and conduct for the members of his church. In the next place, the perfect equality and parity of all bishops, which existed in the early times, these councils by degrees destroyed. For it was necessary that one of the confederated bishops of a province should be entrusted with some authority and power in those conventions over the others; and hence originated the prerogatives of *Metropolitans*. And lastly, when the custom of holding these councils had extended over the Christian world, and the universal church had acquired the form of a vast republic, composed of many lesser ones, certain head men were wanted for its leaders in different parts of the world, who might manage to keep the whole mass together. Hence came *Patriarchs*, and ultimately a *Prince of Patriarchs*, the Roman bishop.

§ 4. No small honour and profit accrued to the whole order of men who conducted the affairs of the church, from the time when they succeeded in persuading the people to regard them as *successors* of the Jewish priests. This took place not long after the reign of *Adrian*, when, upon the second destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews lost all hope of seeing their commonwealth restored. The bishops now wished to be thought to correspond with the high priest of the Jews; the *presbyters* were said to come in place of the priests; and the *deacons* were made parallel with the Levites. Those who first drew this parallel between offices so totally different, probably made the misrepresentation, not so much from design as from ignorance. But this idea being once introduced and approved, among other errors resulting from it, I will mention only this, that it established a wider difference between the teachers and

the learners, than accords with the nature of the Christian religion³.

§ 5. Among the doctors of this century, whose writings rendered them particularly famous in after-ages, was *Justin Martyr*, a converted philosopher, who had dipped into nearly every sect in philosophy. He was pious, and possessed considerable learning, but he was sometimes an incautious disputant, and was ignorant of ancient history. We have, among other works of his, two *Apologies* for the Christians, which are justly held in great estimation⁴. *Irenæus*, bishop of Lyons, in

³ [This comparison of Christian teachers with the Jewish priesthood, among other consequences, led the former to lay claim to *tithes* and *first-fruits*; of which we find mention before the times of Constantine. Perhaps a desire to increase their revenues, which were both small and precarious, led some of the bishops to apply Jewish law to the Christian church. That they claimed *first-fruits*, as of divine right, in this century, is clear from Irenæus, *contra Hæres.* l. iv. c. 17 and 34. That *tithes* were not yet claimed, at least in the Latin church, appears from the latter of these passages in Irenæus. Yet in the Greek and oriental churches, tithes began to be claimed earlier than among the Latins; and probably in this *second* century, for the Greek writers of the *third* century, and the *Apostolic Constitutions*, (which seem to contain the ecclesiastical laws of the Greek church,) mention tithes as a thing then well known.—See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christianor.* § c. p. 271. *Tr.*—Tithes had been commonly paid among pagans from time immemorial. Their origin, therefore, is not to be sought in the Mosaic dispensation, but in that patriarchal faith, which is at the bottom of every religious system. Fixed endowments are, indeed, necessary both for the interests of religion, and the reasonable expectations of its ministers. To found a patronage for piety in the tenth of human wealth, was an obvious mode of meeting this necessity. See Alp. Potter's *Discourse of Church Government*, Lond. 1707. p. 430. *Ed.*]

⁴ [Justin Martyr was the son of Priscus, and grandson of Bacchius, pagan Grecians, settled at Flavia Neapolis (Naples), the ancient Sichem, in Samaria. See *Apolog.* i. c. 1. He had successive masters in philosophy, Stoic,

Peripatetic, Pythagorean, and lastly Platonie. He travelled much, and was very eager in the pursuit of knowledge, and especially respecting the Divine Being. When about 23 years old, as is conjectured, and about A. D. 137, he was converted to Christianity, in consequence of being directed by an aged Christian to go to the Bible, as the source of true philosophy. He afterwards spent most of his time at Rome; where he lived as a Christian philosopher, and devoted all his talents to the furtherance of the gospel. At last, A.D. 164 or 167, he suffered martyrdom, one Crescens, a pagan philosopher, being his accuser, and on the simple charge of his being a Christian. His writings are numerous, erudite, all of them theological, and all of a polemic character. His style is harsh and inelegant, his temper is ardent and decisive, and his arguments and opinions are not always satisfactory. Yet being the first of the learned divines, and a very zealous and active Christian, he merits our particular attention. His life and writings are described by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* l. iv. c. 11, 12, 16—18. Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 23. Photius, *Biblioth.* cccxxii. and others among the ancients; and by Cave, Du Pin, Longerue, Maran, Milner (*Hist. of the Ch.* vol. i. p. 161, &c. ed. Boston, 1822), and others among the moderns.—About A. D. 140, he composed two learned treatises against the pagans; *Cohortatio ad Græcos*, and *Oratio ad Græcos*. The substance of the former, which is the largest, is this: "The Greeks have no sources of certain and satisfactory knowledge of religion. What their poets state concerning the gods is ridiculous and absurd. Jupiter, for example, according to Homer, would have been incarcerated by the other gods, if they had not feared Briareus. And Jupiter

France, whose only remaining writings are his five books *against Heresies*, which, though a mere Latin translation from the

himself betrayed his weakness by his amours. Mars and Venus were wounded by Diomedes, &c. Thales derived all things from water; Anaximenes, from air; Heraclitus, from fire, &c. But it is not possible for the human mind to search out divine things; it needs aid from above; it must be moved by the divine Spirit, as the lyre must by the plectrum. This was the fact with the Hebrew prophets; who, besides, were much older than the Grecian poets, lawgivers, and philosophers. Even the heathen writers admit the high antiquity of the Jewish legislation, *e. g.* Ptolemon, Appion, Ptolemy Mendesius, Helianicus, &c.; and Philo, Josephus, and Diodorus Siculus confirm it. An Egyptian king, Ptolemy (Philadelphus), therefore, caused the ancient Hebrew books to be translated into Greek, by 70 men, who were inclosed in as many separate cells: when they had finished their translations, they were found perfectly agreeing, not only in the sense but in the words. Justin himself had seen the vestiges of these cells. The Greeks derived their best thoughts from the Hebrews. Thus Orpheus, Homer, Solon, Pythagoras, and Plato, are known to have acquired their best knowledge in Egypt. Hence, Orpheus, the Sibyls, Homer, Sophocles, &c. were enabled to write about the unity of God; the judgment after death, &c. When Plato, for instance, says: Virtue must be *given* to men by the Deity; he borrowed the idea from the prophets; and to conceal the fact, he substituted *virtue* in place of the *Holy Spirit*. When he says: Time began with heaven; it is clear, that he borrowed from Moses' writings, &c. Since, therefore, the Grecian philosophers themselves confess their ignorance, and the Sibyls direct to the coming of Christ, men should go to the prophets, as to the source of all truth."—The shorter work, entitled, *Oratio ad Græcos*, is similar in its contents. Indeed, this may serve as a fair specimen of the ground taken by the Christian fathers generally, in their controversies with learned pagans. About A. D. 150, or, as some think, 10 or 12 years earlier, Justin presented his earliest or long *Apology* for the Christians to the emperor Antoninus Pius: and a little before his death, or after A. D. 160, his other *Apology*, an

imperfect copy of which is improperly called his *first Apology*. The substance of the larger *Apology*, which is written with little method, is this: "Why are Christians condemned merely for their name, without inquiry whether they are malefactors? Let *this* be investigated; then punish the guilty, and let the innocent go free. The Christians are accused of *atheism*; but unjustly. They worship God the Father, the Son, and the prophetic or divine Spirit. They offer indeed no sacrifices: but they believe God requires none. Christians are ridiculed for expecting a kingdom of Christ; but unjustly. The kingdom which they expect, is not an earthly kingdom; if it *were*, how could they so cheerfully meet death? Christianity is not so totally unlike every thing believed by the pagans. The pagans expect a judgment after death; so do the Christians. The former make Rhadamanthus the judge; the latter Jesus Christ. The pagans believe, that many men were sons of Jupiter; Christians believe, that Jesus was the Son of God. The pagans assert, that Æsculapius healed the sick in a wonderful manner; Christians assert the same of Christ, &c. The ground of this correspondence lies in this, that the demons, who were the authors of the pagan religion, and to whom the pagan worship is paid, copied beforehand the history of Christ, in order to prejudice the truth. Yet they omitted to copy the *cross*, which is the appropriate sign of the power of Christ; (and therefore it is found indispensable in nature, *e. g.* in the yards of a ship.) Also, by the ascent of Simon Magus to heaven, they sought to imitate the ascension of Christ: and since the Romans themselves have erected a statue to this Simon as a god, they should more readily do the same to Christ. Christianity is *true*. This is demonstrable from the prophecies of the Old Testament. (Here again, the antiquity of the Old Testament is asserted; and the principle maintained, that the Greeks borrowed from the Hebrews.) Also, the prophecies of Christ, concerning his ascension to heaven, and the destruction of Jerusalem, which have been fulfilled, prove the truth of Christianity. Christ is the *Logos*, (the *reason* or *intelligence*;) of which all men participate; so that every one

Greek, are a splendid monument of antiquity⁵. *Athenagoras* was no contemptible philosopher; and his *Apology* for the

who has ever lived according to *Logos*, (*reason*,) was a Christian. The demons, whose worship is prostrated by Christianity, are the authors of the persecutions against Christians."—Some points in this *Apology* are here omitted, because contained in the other summaries.

The shorter *Apology* commences with an account of some persecutions; which are ascribed to the malice of the demons. It then gives reasons why Christians do not shun martyrdom: and also, why God permits persecution. "God entrusted the government of the world to angels: these afterwards apostatized from God, and taking human wives, begat the demons; and by them and their offspring, the human race is now oppressed and ruined. God would, before this, have destroyed the world, had he not spared it for the sake of the Christians. Yet it is to be destroyed hereafter, and by fire." "Jesus Christ is superior to Socrates; for no one ever died for the doctrine of the latter. The constancy of Christians under persecution is evidence of their innocence." These summaries of Justin's *Apologies* are specimens of the ground taken by all the ancient Apologists, whose works have come down to us. Besides the four works now mentioned, Justin wrote a book, *de Monarchia Dei*, proving the divine unity, in opposition to polytheism, by testimonies from the Old Testament, and likewise from pagan writers. The latter part of the book is preserved.—Against the Jews he composed, in the latter part of his life, his *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judeo*. He defends Christianity against the Jews, chiefly by arguments from the ancient prophecies and types of Christ in the Old Testament. He also wrote a book against Marcion, and another against all the heresies; both of which are unfortunately lost. So are his book concerning the *Soul*, (in which he collected the opinions of the philosophers on that subject,) and his book entitled, *Psaltes*. There are several other works now extant, under his name, which are either doubted or denied to be his: namely, an *Epistle to Diognetus*, and another to Zenas and Serenus; 146 *Questions and their solutions to the Orthodox*; *Exposition of the true Faith* (on the Trinity); *Metaphysical Questions* (Quæ-

tionēs Græcæniere) and answers; *Questions to the Greeks, and their answers refuted*; a *confutation of some Aristotelian doctrines*, &c. Justin's works make a considerable folio volume. They were well edited, Paris, 1636, reprinted, Cologne, 1686: but still better in the Benedictine ed. by Prudent, Maran, Paris, 1742. Thirlby's ed. of the *Dialogæ*, London, 1722, fol., is good. The two *Apologies*, with those of Tertullian and Minutius Felix, are given in English by W. Reeve, London, 1707, 2 vols. 8vo. *Tr.*—English readers who wish to form an opinion of this father, should read *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr*, by Bishop Kaye. Nor should this work be overlooked by the scholar. *Ed.*]

⁵ [Irenæus, who was active during the last half of this century, was born and educated in Asia Minor, under Polycarp and Papias. About A.D. 150, Pothinus and others went from Asia Minor to Lyons and Vienne in France; and Irenæus, then a young man, is supposed to have been one of those missionaries. He remained a presbyter till the death of Pothinus, A.D. 177, when he succeeded him in the episcopal chair at Lyons, which he filled till about A.D. 202, the time of his martyrdom. While a presbyter he was sent to Rome, by his church, concerning the affair of Montanus. He is supposed to have composed the letter written in the name of the churches of Lyons and Vienne, giving the graphic account of their persecution in A.D. 177. He likewise took an active part in the controversy respecting Easter, A.D. 196; and wrote to Victor, bishop of Rome, on the subject; and also to the presbyter Blastus, who was deposed at Rome during that contest. Eusebius has also preserved part of a letter of his to Florinus, an apostate to Gnosticism, with whom Irenæus had been intimate in his youth. Some other small works of his are mentioned by the ancients. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* l. v. c. 15, 20, 24, 26. Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* cap. 35.—But the great work of Irenæus, is his examination and confutation of the misnamed (*γνῶσις*) knowledge in five books, commonly called *Libri contra Hæreses*. The work is altogether polemic, and is directed particularly against Valentinus, yet so as to be a confutation of all the

Christians, and his treatise on the Resurrection of the body, display both learning and genius⁶. *Theophilus*, bishop of Antioch, has left us three books, addressed to one Autolyceus, in defence of Christianity, which are erudite but not well digested⁷.

Gnostics, and a defence of the catholic faith against most of the heretics of that age. The book contains much information respecting the early heretics, their origin, sentiments, and characters; also respecting the state of theological science in that age, the doctrines generally received and taught, and the manner of stating and defending them. But unfortunately, the original Greek is lost, except the extracts preserved by Eusebius, Epiphanius, and others; and the Latin translation, which is very ancient, is extremely barbarous, and sometimes scarcely intelligible.—Irenæus was an ardent and sincere Christian, and a discreet and amiable man. He possessed considerable learning and influence; but his mind does not appear to have been one of the highest order. As an interpreter of Scripture, like all the early fathers, he was too fond of tracing allegories; and as a theologian, few of the moderns will account him entirely correct in principle, or perfectly conclusive in his reasonings.—See, concerning his life and writings, Cave, *Du Pin*, Massuet, (works of Irenæus,) the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. v. June, p. 335. *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tom. i. p. 51, and Milner, *Hist. of the Ch. century iii.* ch. i. vol. i. p. 215, ed. Bost. 1822.—The best editions of his works are by Grabe, Lond. 1702, fol., and the Benedictine by Massuet, Paris, 1710, and Venice, 1734, 2 tom. fol. *Tr.*—Upon this father and his work full information will be found, in *An Account of the Life and Writings of S. Irenæus*, by J. Beaven, Lond. 1841. *Ed.*]

⁶ [Athenagoras, one of the most elegant and able writers the church has produced, is scarcely mentioned by any of the fathers. Methodius, about A.D. 285, quoted from him (see Epiphanius, *Haris.* 65); Philip Sidetes, about A.D. 400, gives some lame account of him (in Dodwell's *Diss. on Irenæus*, p. 408); and Photius (*Bibliotheca*), in the ninth century, speaks of him. This is all the fathers tell us. It appears from the title of his Apology, that he was a Christian philosopher of Athens; and that he wrote his Apology in the reign of the emperors Marcus and Commodus.—Phi-

lip Sidetes, who is a writer of little credit, says, that he presided in the school at Alexandria, before Panteus; which is contradicted by Eusebius; and that he was converted to Christianity by reading the Scriptures with a design to confute them, which may be true. Dr. Mosheim, in his *Diss. de vera ætate Apologæti Athenag.* (*Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles.* vol. i. p. 269, &c.) has proved, that the Apology was written A.D. 177, the very year of the persecutions at Lyons and Vienne. Athenagoras descants on the same topics as Justin Martyr, and employs the same arguments; but his composition is immensely superior as to style and method.—His other work, *de Resurrectione*, is written with equal elegance, and contains the arguments used in that age, to support the doctrine of the resurrection of the body against the objections of philosophers. His works, besides being printed separately by Edw. Dechair, Oxford, 1706, 8vo, are commonly subjoined to those of Justin Martyr; and the best editions are those of Grabe, Lond. 1802, and Massuet, Paris, 1710. *Tr.*]

⁷ [Theophilus was made bishop of Antioch in Syria, A.D. 168, and died about A.D. 182 or 183. The best accounts of him, by the ancients, are those of Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 20, 23, and Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 25.—He appears to have been a converted pagan, a man of reading, a decided and active Christian pastor, sound in faith, and zealous for the truth. He is not metaphysical, but still is rather a dry and argumentative writer. He composed a book against Hermogenes; and another against Marcion; and a Commentary on the four Gospels: all of which are lost. His great work, and the only one which has reached us, is his three books, addressed to his pagan friend Autolyceus, in vindication of Christianity. Here he takes much the same ground with Justin Martyr and the other Apologists: but he descends more into detail, in his proofs from Scripture and from history. He is fond of allegorical and fanciful interpretations, and on them rests a large part of his arguments. For example: about the middle of the second book he makes (*ἐν ἀρχῇ*)

Clemens Alexandrinus, a presbyter, and head of the catechetical school at Alexandria, was a man of extensive reading, and especially in the works of ancient authors. This is manifest from the works of his that remain; namely, his *Stromata*⁸, his *Pædagogus*, and *ad Græcos Exhortatio*. But he was infected with very great errors, into which he was betrayed by his excessive love of philosophy: nor are his works to be commended for good arrangement and perspicuity of style⁹. In

in the beginning, Gen. i. 1, to mean, by *Christ*. The constitution by which vegetables spring up from seeds and roots, was designed to teach the resurrection of our bodies. The dry lands surrounded by seas, denote the church surrounded by enemies. The sun is a type of God; as the moon is of man, that frail changeable creature. The three days preceding the creation of the sun and moon, (*τῶποι εἰσὶν τριῶδες τοῦ Θεοῦ*.) are typical of the *Trinity* of God, and his Word, and his Wisdom. (This is said to be the earliest occurrence of the word *Trinity* in the writings of the fathers.) The fixed stars, among which the sun moves, indicate righteous and holy men who serve God; and the planets denote heretics and apostates, &c. &c.—Yet the work is not all of this character. It contains much that is instructive and solid, and is written in a plain, familiar style. *Tr.*]

⁸ [*Stromata*, or *Tapestry-work*, from the variety of its contents.—Clement's *Stromata* (A.D. 200) was written with a design of converting the learned heathen." Newman's *Arians*, 53. 74. *Ed.*]

⁹ [Titus Flavius Clemens, whether born at Athens or Alexandria, was a pagan in early life, and devoted himself to philosophy. He travelled in Greece, in south Italy, in Cœlo-Syria, in Palestine, and lastly in Egypt, where he was a pupil of Pantenus, the master of the Christian school at Alexandria. Becoming a Christian, he was made a presbyter of the Alexandrian church, and succeeded his preceptor Pantenus, as master of the catechetical or divinity school. He taught with great applause during the reign of Severus, (A.D. 193—211,) and had Origen and other eminent men of the third century for pupils.—About A.D. 202, he retired into Palestine and Syria, for a short time, to avoid persecution. He is supposed to have died about A.D. 220.—Clement had vast learning, a lively imagination, great

fluency, considerable discrimination, and was a bold and independent speculator. That he had true piety, and held the essential truths of the Gospel, is admitted by all; but no one of the fathers, except Origen, has been more censured, in modern times, for an excessive attachment to philosophy or metaphysical theology. He was a true *Eclectic*, which he also professed to be; that is, he followed no master implicitly, but examined and judged for himself. Yet his education and the atmosphere in which he lived, led him to lean towards Platonism and Stoicism. His great error was, that he overrated the value of philosophy, or human reason, as a guide in matters of religion. He also indulged his imagination, as all the learned of this age did, to excess; and construed the Bible allegorically and fancifully.—His three principal works, which have reached us, constitute one whole. His *Exhortatio ad Græcos* was intended to convince and convert pagans. It exposes the nakedness of polytheism, and demonstrates the truth and excellence of Christianity. His *Pædagogus*, in three books, was intended to instruct a young convert in the practice of Christianity. It is an indifferent performance, dwells much on trivial rules of conduct, and does not go to the bottom even of external morality. His *Stromata*, in eight books, (the last of which is not the genuine eighth book,) are written without method, or in a most discursive manner. In them Clement attempts to give the world his most profound thoughts and speculations on theology and the kindred sciences.—He has also left us a practical treatise, entitled, *Quis dices ille sit, qui salvetur?* in which his object is to show to what temptations and dangers the *rich* are exposed. There are ascribed to him, and printed with his works, extracts from the writings of Theodotus and the oriental philosophy (the contents of some one's note book respecting the Gnostics), and

the Latin language, scarcely any one in this century illustrated the Christian religion, except *Tertullian*. He was at first a juriconsult, then a presbyter at Carthage, and at last a follower of *Montanus*. We have various short works of his, which aim either to explain and defend the truth, or to excite piety. Which were the greatest, his excellences or his defects, it is difficult to say. He possessed great genius, but it was wild and unchastened. His piety was active and fervent, but likewise gloomy and austere. He had a great fund of literature and learning, but he was fickle and credulous, and rather subtle than solid¹.

selections from the prophets (of no great value), which may be taken from the loose papers of Clement, yet are dubious. — Eusebius and Jerome mention works of his, which are now lost. Of these the principal are, *Libri VIII. Hypotyposcon*, a compendious exposition of the Old and New Testament. The others were tracts; *de Paschate*, *de Jejunio*, *de Obliteratione*, *Labortatio ad Pauliniana*, and *Canon Ecclesiasticus*, or *de Canonibus Ecclesiasticis*. — The character and writings of Clement have been elaborately investigated by various persons, among whom are N. le Nourry (*Apparat. ad Biblioth. Patr.*), J. G. Walch (*Miscellanea Sacra*), J. Brucker (*Hist. Crit. Philoa.*), and A. Neander, *Kirchenyesh.* vol. i. — The best edition of his works is that of Potter, Oxon. 1715, fol. *Tr.* — The present Bishop of Lincoln (Kaye) has rendered ample information upon this Father, universally accessible, in *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria.* Ed.]

¹ Those who wish further information concerning these writers, their defects and their works, are directed, — and the direction is given once for all, — to consult those authors who treat professedly of the Ecclesiastical Writers; namely, J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca and Biblioth. Latina*. W. Cave, *Historia Literaria Scriptor. Eccles.* L. Ellies du Pin and Remigius Cellier, in their *Bibliothecæ* of Ecclesiastical Writers in French, and others.

[Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus was the son of a pagan centurion of proconsular rank, and born at Carthage about A. D. 160. He was bred to the law; but becoming a Christian, was made a presbyter in the church of Carthage, where he appears to have spent

his whole life. About A. D. 200, he embraced the sentiments of the Montanists, which he afterwards defended with his usual ardour. He is said to have lived to a great age; and yet he is supposed to have died about A. D. 220. — Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 53. Eusebius, *Chronicon*, ann. 16 Severi, and others, give him a high character. Jerome tells us, that Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, was accustomed to read some portions of his works daily; and in calling for this author, used to say, *Da magistrum, bring my master*. He wrote with great force, and displayed much both of erudition and acuteness; but his style is concise, harsh, and extremely difficult for modern readers. His diction and his spirit, too, it has been supposed, were extensively propagated in the Latin church. — His works consist of about 30 short treatises, and are nearly all of a polemic cast, argumentative, vituperative, and severe. They may be divided into three classes; namely, *apologetic*, or, in controversy with pagans and Jews; — *doctrinal*, or confutations of heretics; — and *moral*, in defence or confutation of certain practices or rules of conduct. — Of the first class, are his *Apologeticum*, and *Ad Nationes Libri II.* These are only different editions of the same work, and were composed about A. D. 193: *de Testimonio Animæ*; the testimony of conscience or common sense to the truths maintained by Christians: *ad Scapulam*, a pagan magistrate; an expostulation with him (A. D. 211): *ulceros Judæos*; proving from the Old Testament that Jesus was the Messiah, and Christianity true. — In all these, he takes the same ground with Justin Martyr and the other apologists of that age. — Of the second or doctrinal class, are, *de Baptismo*; against

one Quintilla, who rejected baptism altogether: *de Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*; a confutation of all heresies collectively, on general principles: *Libri V. Ado. Marcionem*, (A. D. 207,) and single books against the Valentinians, Praxeas, and Hermogenes: *Scorpiace*, or *Scorpiacum*, *ado. Gnosticos*, or *de bono martyrii*; that is, an Antidote against the Scorpions, i. e. the Gnostics, who have no martyrs among them: *de Carne Christi*; that Christ truly died on the cross; maintained against the Docetæ: *de Resurrectione*; of the same tenor with the last: *de Anima*; against the philosophers; their notions of the soul confuted.—In attacking the heretics, he takes much the same ground with Irenæus.—Most of his works of the third class were written after he became a Montanist, and are in defence of the rigid principles of that sect, or in opposition to the opinions and practice of Christians in general. The two first, however, were written in his early life, and are of a different character; viz. *de Oratione*; on prayer in general, and the Lord's prayer in particular: *Liber ad Martyras*; designed to comfort and animate them in their dying moments: *de Spectaculis*, and *de Idololatria*; warnings to Christians against attending theatres, and other idolatrous rites: *Libri II. ad uxorem*; warning her against a second marriage, if she should become a widow; and especially against marrying a pagan: *de Penitentia*; on penance and humiliation for sin: *de Patientia*.—All the preceding of this class were probably written before he became an avowed Montanist:—*de Corona Militis*; justifying and commending a soldier who refused a military crown, and was punished for it: *de Velandis Virginibus*; against the custom of the young ladies appearing abroad unveiled: *de Habitu Muliebris*; reprehension of the ladies for their attention to dress: *de Cultu Fœminarum*; much the same; on their adorning their persons: *de Fuga in Persecutione*; that no one should retire for safety in time of persecution: *Exhortatio Castitatis*, and *de Monogamia*; two tracts on the same subject; namely, the criminality of second marriages: *de Jeuniis ado. Psychicos*; against the orthodox, in defence of the Montanist principles about fasting: *de Pudicitia*; that offenders, especially by unchastity, should never be restored to communion in the church: *de Pallio*; against wearing the Roman toga, and recommending, in place of it, the Grecian

pallium or cloak.—These are all the works of Tertullian which have reached us. Among his lost works, were seven books in defence of the Montanists; one on the Believer's hope; one on Paradise; and one on Aaron's garments. The best editions of his works are by Rigaltius, Paris, 1634 and 1641, fol. and by Semler, Halle, 1769—73, 5 vols. 8vo, with a 6th vol. by Windorf, containing indices and a Glossary, 1776.

(Full information upon this Father and the religion of his day, will be found in a work by Bp. Kaye, published while he held the see of Bristol, entitled, *The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, illustrated from the writings of Tertullian*. Ed.)

Besides the writers above mentioned, whose works have been preserved, there were many others in this century, of whose works we have only extracts preserved by the fathers. Of these, a catalogue, embracing such as are mentioned by Eusebius in his *Eccles. History*, and by Jerome, *de Scriptoribus Illustribus*, is here subjoined.

Papias, bp. of Hierapolis in Phrygia, contemporary with Ignatius, in the beginning of the century. He wrote five books, containing traditional accounts of Christ, his apostles, and others of the primitive times. He is said to have advocated the doctrine of the Millennium. Euseb. iii. 39. Jerome, c. 18.

Quadratus, bp. of Athens. He wrote an Apology for the Christians, presented to the emperor Adrian, A. D. 123 or 131. Euseb. iv. 3. Jerome, c. 19.

Aristides, an eloquent Christian philosopher of Athens, at the same time presented an Apology. Euseb. iv. 3. Jerome, c. 20.

Agrippa Castor, contemporary with the two last. He was "a very learned man," and wrote a confutation of the 24 books of Basilides the heretic. Euseb. iv. 7. Jerome, c. 21.

Hegesippus, a converted Jew, who resided at Corinth and at Rome. He wrote, about A. D. 160, five books, now lost, of Ecclesiastical History, from the crucifixion of Christ to his own times. Euseb. v. 8. 22; and iii. 19, 20. 32. Jerome, c. 22.

Melito, bp. of Sardis. He wrote an Apology, besides various short works; namely, *de Pascha* (the time of Easter); *de Vita Prophetarum*; *de Ecclesia*; *de Die Dominica*; *de Sensibus*; *de Fide*; *De Plasmate*; *de Anima et Corpore*; *de Baptismate*; *de Veritate*; *de Generatione*

Christi; de Prophetia; de Philoemia; a book entitled *Claris; de Diabolo, de Apocalypsi Johannis, de Corporato Deo*. Euseb. iv. 26. Jerome, c. 24.

Apollinaris, bp. of Hierapolis in Phrygia, A.D. 170. He wrote an Apology; five books against the pagans; *de Veritate*, Libri ii.; *ade. Cataphrygias; ade. Judæos*, Libri ii. Euseb. iv. 27. Jerome, c. 16.

Dionysius, bp. of Corinth, from about A.D. 170. He was an active and influential man, and wrote valuable Epistles to several churches and their bishops; namely, to the churches of Sparta, Athens, Nicomedia, Gortyna, and others in Crete; Amastria, and others in Pontus; and to Pinitus, a Cretan bp., and Victor, bp. of Rome. Euseb. iv. 23. Jerome, c. 27.

Tatian, a rhetorician, and disciple of Justin Martyr. After the death of Justin, he swerved from the common path, and became founder of a rigorous sect called Encratites. He flourished about A.D. 170, and wrote an Apology, under the title of *Oratio contra Græcos*, which is still extant, and usually printed with the works of Justin Martyr. He is said to have composed many other works; among which a *Diatessaron*, or *Harmony of the four Gospels*, and a treatise on *Perfection after the pattern of Christ*, are particularly mentioned. Euseb. iv. 29. Jerome, c. 29. Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 12.

Musanus, of the same age, wrote against the Encratites. Jerome, c. 31. Euseb. iv. 28.

Modestus, of the same age, wrote a book against Marcion, which Eusebius says exceeded all other confutations of that heretic. Euseb. iv. 25. Jerome, c. 32.

Bardesanes, a Syrian of Edessa, of the same age, an eloquent and acute reasoner. He was first a Valentinian; but afterwards wrote against that and other sects. His works were numerous, which his admirers translated from Syriac into Greek. His dialogues against Marcion, and his treatise on *Fate*, are particularly commended. Euseb. iv. 30. Jerome, c. 33.

Victor, bp. of Rome A.D. 194—203. His zeal respecting the right day for Easter, led him to write several Epistles on that subject. Euseb. v. 24.

Jerome, c. 34. Nothing of his remains; though two spurious Epistles with his name are still extant.

Pantenus, a Christian philosopher of Alexandria, and head of the catechetical school there, before Clement. He was a learned and active Christian; and wrote much, particularly in explanation of the Scriptures; but none of his works remain. He visited India, or Arabia Felix, as a missionary, and had vast influence in the church. Euseb. v. 10. Jerome, c. 36.

Rhodon, an Asiatic Greek, but educated at Rome under Tatian. He wrote much, and in particular, on the *Hexæmeron* (the six days of creation); a treatise against Marcion; and another against the Phrygians or Cataphrygians, the disciples of Montanus. Euseb. v. 13. Jerome, c. 37.

Miltiades, who flourished in the reign of Commodus A.D. 180—192. He wrote an Apology; a work against the Cataphrygians; two books against the pagans; and two others against the Jews. Euseb. v. 17. Jerome, c. 39.

Apollonius, an eloquent Greek writer, author of a long and much valued confutation of the Cataphrygians. Euseb. v. 18. Jerome, c. 40.

Serapion, ordained bp. of Antioch A.D. 191. He wrote an Epistle concerning the Montanists, or Cataphrygians; another to Dominus, an apostate to Judaism; and a tract concerning the spurious Gospel ascribed to Peter. Euseb. vi. 12. Jerome, c. 41.

Apollonius, a Roman senator and martyr under Commodus. His eloquent defence at his trial was committed to writing. Euseb. v. 21. Jerome, c. 42.

Under the reigns of Commodus and Severus, or A.D. 180—211, lived several writers, mentioned summarily by Euseb. v. 27, and by Jerome, c. 46—51: namely, Heraclitus, author of a *Commentary on Paul's Epistles*; Maximus, who wrote on the *Origin of Evil and the Creation of Matter*; Caudidus and Appion, who wrote on the *Hexæmeron* (Gen. ch. i.); Sextus wrote on the *Resurrection*; and Arabians composed some doctrinal tracts.

All the preceding wrote in Greek, except Bardesanes, who composed in Syriac, and Victor and Apollonius the martyr, who wrote in Latin. *Tr.]*

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Religion yet simple.—§ 2. Was gradually changed.—§ 3. This proved by an example.—§ 4. Attention to the Scriptures.—§ 5. Faults of interpreters.—§ 6. State of dogmatic theology.—§ 7. Polemics of this age.—§ 8. Excellences and defects of the controversialists.—§ 9. Writers on practical religion.—§ 10. Merits of the fathers in regard to practical religion.—§ 11. Twofold system of practical religion.—§ 12. Hence the Ascetics.—§ 13. Causes of their rise.—§ 14. Their progress.—§ 15. Origin of pious frauds.—§ 16. A Christian life, and the discipline of offenders.—§ 17. Public penitence modelled according to the rules of the pagan mysteries.

§ 1. THE whole Christian system was still comprised in a few precepts and propositions; nor did the teachers publicly advance any doctrines besides those contained in what is called the *Apostles' Creed*. In their manner of handling these doctrines, there was nothing subtle, profound, or distant from common apprehension. This will not appear strange, if we reflect that no controversy had yet been moved respecting those important points of religion about which contests afterwards arose, and that the bishops were generally plain, unlearned men, more distinguished for their piety than for their genius and eloquence.

§ 2. Yet insensibly, from this venerable simplicity, there was a considerable departure; many points were more critically investigated, and more artificially stated; many principles also, and these none of the solidest, were imprudently transferred from philosophy to the holier system. Of this change the reasons were chiefly two. One lay in the disposition of certain teachers, who wished to make Christianity appear in harmony with the decisions of philosophy, and thought it a fine thing to state Christian precepts in the language of philosophers, civilians, and rabbins. The other came from the discussions with opponents and corrupters of the truth. In studying to meet these, learned men were sometimes driven by the necessities

of the case itself, to state with an accuracy hitherto unknown, propositions that had never been defined before, and to keep them within certain limitations.

§ 3. Whoever wishes for an example, need only consider the notions which began to get afloat in this age, respecting the state of souls when separated from the body. *Jesus* and his apostles simply taught, that the spirits of holy men on leaving the body were received into heaven, and that those of the wicked went to hell. And this satisfied the first disciples of *Christ*, in whom there was more piety than curiosity. But this plain doctrine was materially injured, when Christians were induced to agree with the Platonics and others, that only the souls of heroes, and of men, without littleness or grossness, were borne aloft; while others, kept down by a weight of fleshly lusts, went off to the realms below, whence emergence into light is hopeless until every stain is purged away¹. From the time when this opinion began to prevail, the *martyrs* only were represented and believed to be happy immediately after death; to others was assigned some obscure region, in which they should be detained, either till the second coming of *Christ*, or at all events, till stains, which disqualify for heaven, should cling to them no more. Hence, how many and how great are the errors that have sprung! how many the vain ceremonies! how many the debasing superstitions!

§ 4. They all revered the holy Scriptures, as the rule of faith and truth; and, therefore, wished them to be in the hands of all. Upon translations of them into other languages, we have already spoken. We shall here speak only of the expositors. The first Christian who composed explanations of the sacred volume, was, if I mistake not, *Pantenus*, the master of the Alexandrian school. But Divine Providence has so ordered, that none of his writings have reached us. The *Hypotyposes*, also, of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, in which he is said to have expounded detached passages from all the sacred books, have been lost; and likewise his *Commentaries on the canonical Epistles*. *Tatian* composed a *Harmony of the Gospels*, which has [not] escaped the ravages of time². *Justin*

¹ I have treated largely of these sentiments of the ancients, and especially of the Platonics, in my notes on R. Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, tom. ii. p. 1036.

² I cannot but think there must be a great typographical error in the original of this sentence. For it is not easy to believe, that Dr. Mosheim held to the long exploded notion, that either of

Martyr explained the *Apocalypse*; *Theophilus* of Antioch elucidated the *four Gospels*; and [many] others expounded the Mosaic account of the creation. All these works are now lost.

§ 5. But this loss is the less to be regretted, since it is certain that of these expositors, no one could be pronounced eminent and luminous. They all believed the language of Scripture to contain *two meanings*; the one *obvious*, and corresponding with the direct import of the words; the other *recondite*, and concealed under the words, like a nut by the shell. The former they neglected, as of little value, their study chiefly being to extract the latter: in other words, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings, by the fictions of their own imaginations, than on searching out their true meanings. Some also, and this is stated especially of *Clement*, accommodated the divine oracles to the precepts of philosophy. Expositors of the Old Testament were met at the outset, in the excessive and almost divine authority of the Alexandrian version, known as the Septuagint, by an obstacle to the production of any thing praiseworthy and out of the common way.

§ 6. A system of Christian theology, so far as we can learn, was composed by no one in this age. The tracts of *Arabianus*, *de dogmate Christiano*, having been all lost, we cannot tell what they were. The five books of *Papias*, *de Dictis Christi et Apostolorum*, or, *Explanatio oraculorum dominicorum*, so far as can be learned from *Eusebius*³, must be regarded rather as a historical than a doctrinal work. *Melito* of Sardis is said to have written, *de Fide*, *de Creatione*, and *de Veritate*: but it does not appear from these titles, whether they were polemic or doctrinal treatises. Some points in theology were stated with unusual clearness by those who engaged in religious controversies. But the doctrines which were not brought into dispute, are seldom found so distinctly treated by the writers of that age, as to make it quite clear what they thought. It is not, therefore, strange, that all sects of Christians can find

those *Harmonies* of the four Gospels, which we have in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, could be the genuine work of Tatian. See Prudentius Maran, Diss. xiii. c. 12, § 5, 6, prefixed to his edition of *Justin Martyr*, &c. and republished by Spre-

nger, *Thesaurus Rei Patristicæ*, tom. ii. Tr.]

³ [Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iii. c. 29. See also Irenæus, *adv. Hæres.* l. v. c. 33. Jerome, *de Scriptoribus Illustr.* cap. 18. Tr.]

in what are called the *Fathers*, something to favour their own systems and opinions.

§ 7. The controversial writers who distinguished themselves in this century, encountered either the *Jews*, or the *worshippers of idol gods*, or the corrupters of the Christian doctrine and founders of new sects, that is, the *heretics*. With the *Jews*, contended in particular *Justin Martyr*, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, and likewise *Tertullian*; but neither of them in the best manner, because they were not acquainted with the language and history of the Hebrews, and did not duly consider the subject. The *pagans* were assailed especially, by those who wrote *Apologies* for the Christians; as *Athenagoras*, *Melito*, *Quadratus*, *Miltiades*, *Aristides*, *Tatian*, and *Justin Martyr*; or who composed *Exhortations to the Gentiles*; as *Justin*, *Tertullian*, *Clement*, and *Theophilus* of Antioch. All these beat down superstition solidly and dexterously, besides exposing the calumnies cast upon Christ's disciples; but they were not equally able and successful, either in explaining the nature of the Christian religion, or in demonstrating its truth and divine origin. At least, we think much wanting in the explanations that they give of Christian doctrines, and in the arguments that they use in confirmation of religious truth. Those who chastised the *heretics* make a numerous body; but we have few of their writings left. The whole host of *heretics* were attacked by *Ireneus* in a work expressly against them; by *Clement* in his *Stromata*; and by *Tertullian*, *de Præscriptionibus adversus hæreticos*; not to mention *Justin Martyr*, whose confutation of them has been lost. Those who wrote against particular sects, it would be tedious to enumerate; besides, the most of works of them are not preserved.

§ 8. In these disputants there was something more of ingenuousness and good faith, than in those who undertook the support of truth in the following centuries. For the convenient wiles of sophistry, and the dishonourable artifices of debate, had not yet gained admittance among Christians. Yet a man of sound judgment, who has due regard for truth, cannot extol them highly. Most of them lack discernment, knowledge, good arrangement, application, and force. They often advance very flimsy arguments, and such as were suited rather to embarrass the mind than convince it. One, laying aside the divine Scriptures, from which all the weapons of religious con-

troversy should be drawn, bids us consult the bishops of those churches which were founded by apostles. Another, as if contending about the title or boundaries of lands in a court of law, with an ill grace pleads *prescription* against his adversaries. A third imitates the silly disputants among the Jews, who offered as arguments the mystic powers of numbers and words⁴. Nor are those wholly in error, who think that the vicious mode of disputing which afterwards obtained the name of *œconomical*, was sometimes used even in this century⁵.

§ 9. The principal points of moral discipline are treated of by *Justin Martyr*, or whoever it was that composed the *Epistle to Zenas and Serenus*, found among the works of Justin. Others took up particular duties in set treatises. Thus *Clemens*, who gained a distinctive name from Alexandria, wrote tracts on *Calumny*, *Patience*, *Continence*, and other virtues, which have not escaped the ravages of time. But the small pieces which *Tertullian* left in this line of writing, on *Chastity*, on *Flight from persecution*, on *Fasting*, on *Theatrical exhibitions*, on the *Dress of females*, on *Prayer*, and other things, have come safely to our hands. They would be perused with greater profit, were it not for the gloomy and morose spirit which they every where breathe, and the excessively artificial and difficult style in which they are written⁶.

§ 10. On the degree of estimation due to these, and other ancient writers on the duties of a Christian life, learned men are not agreed. Some hold them to be the very best guides to real piety; others, on the contrary, think their precepts the worst possible, and that moral discipline could not be committed to parties less worthy of reliance⁷. Competent

⁴ Examples may be seen in Ja. Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, tome iii. p. 660. 694.

⁵ R. Simon, *Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* cap. ii. p. 21. [*To do or to say any thing*, καὶ οἰκονομίαν, or οἰκονομικῶς, is to use *deception* or *good policy*, rather than fair honest dealing; yet with good intentions, or for a good end. See Suicer, *Thesaur. Ecclesiast.* tom. ii. p. 459. Tr.]

⁶ ["We cannot, among the merits of *Tertullian*, reckon that of a natural, flowing, and perspicuous style. He frequently hurries his readers along by his vehemence, and surprises them by the vigour, as well as inexhaustible fertility

of his imagination; but his copiousness is without selection, and there was in his character a propensity to exaggeration which affected his language, and rendered it inflated and unnatural. He is, indeed, the harshest and most obscure of writers, and the least capable of being accurately represented in a translation." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 67. Ed.]

⁷ On this subject in our day the learned and ingenious Jo. Barbeyrac held a controversy with Remigius Cellicr, a Benedictine monk. A history of the controversy, with his own opinion of it, is given by J. E. Buddeus, *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, lib. ii. cap. iv. § iv. p. 553, &c. Afterwards, Barbeyrac published a

judges must decide the question for themselves. To us it appears that their writings contain many things excellent, well considered, and well calculated to enkindle piety; but also many things unduly rigorous, and derived from the Stoics and Academies; many things vague and indeterminate; many things besides, positively false, and inconsistent with the precepts of *Christ*. If one deserve the title of a bad master in morals, who neither sees the proper limitations of Christian duties, nor has clear and distinct conceptions of the different virtues and vices, nor discerns correctly those general principles which should keep in check every discussion upon Christian goodness, being, therefore, very liable to talk at random, and blunder in expounding the divine laws; though he may say many excellent things, and make an impression on the mind; then I can readily grant, that in strict truth this title belongs to many of the *Fathers*.

§ 11. In this century there was admitted, with good intentions no doubt, yet most inconsiderately, a principle in morals, radically false, and most injurious to the Christian cause, but one that has through every age, even to our own, been infinitely prolific in errors and ills of various kinds. *Jesus* our Saviour prescribed one standard and rule of living to all his disciples. But the Christian doctors, either by too great a desire of imitating the nations among whom they lived, or from a natural propensity to austerity and gloom, (which is a disease that many labour under in Syria, Egypt, and other provinces of the East,) were induced to maintain that *Christ* had prescribed a *twofold rule of holiness and virtue*; the one ordinary, the other extraordinary; the one lower, the other higher; the one for men of business, the other for persons of leisure, and

more full defence of the severe judgment which he had passed upon the *Fathers*, under the title of *Traité de la Morale des Pères*, Amsterdam, 1728, 4to, which is well worth reading by those who wish to investigate the subject; yet I think he charges the *Fathers* with some faults which may easily be excused. [Liberatus Fassonius, a Catholic, published an answer to Barbeyrac in a Latin work, *de Morali Patrum Doctrina, ad. librum Jo. Barbeyraci, Liburnici, 1767, 4to*. Fassonius excuses the *Fathers* for the following opinions, charged upon them as errors by Barbeyrac; namely, that they condemned taking interest for

money loaned; placed too high a value on virginity, and accounted celibacy a more holy state than matrimony; forbade husbands sleeping with their wives while pregnant; deemed it unsuitable for clergymen to marry, and excluded from the ministry such as married a second time; commended a monastic life; made two systems of duty, one for the more perfect, and another for common Christians; and held it lawful to persecute heretics with fire and sword. Most of the other faults charged on the *Fathers* by Barbeyrac, Fassonius maintains, should be charged solely on the heretics. *Tr.*]

such as sought to attain higher glory in the future world. They therefore early divided all that had been taught, whether in books or by tradition, respecting human life and morals, into *Precepts* and *Counsels*. They applied the name of *Precepts* to those laws which were universally obligatory, being meant for men of all descriptions; but the *Counsels* concerned only those who deemed it glorious to aim at higher things, and a closer union with God.

§ 12. On a sudden there arose accordingly a class of persons, who professed to strive after that higher and more eminent holiness than common Christians can attain; and who resolved to obey the *counsels* of *Christ*, in order to enjoy intimate communion with God in this life, and on leaving the body to rise without impediment or difficulty to the celestial world. They thought many things forbidden to them, which were allowed to other Christians; such as wine, flesh, matrimony, and worldly business⁸. They supposed that they must emaciate their bodies with watching, fasting, toil, and hunger. They considered it a happiness to retire into desert places, and by close meditation to abstract their minds from external objects and sensual delights. Both men and women imposed these hard conditions on themselves with good intentions, I believe, but the example was bad, and did great harm to the Christian cause. They thus obtained the names of *Ascetics*, Σπουδαῖοι, Ἐκλεκτοὶ, *philosophers*, and even *she-philosophers*; nor were they distinguished from other Christians only by a different appellation, but also by peculiarities of dress and demeanour⁹. Those of this century, who embraced this austere mode of life, lived indeed entirely upon a system of their own, but they did not withdraw themselves altogether from the society and converse of men. In process of time, however, such persons retired into deserts; afterwards they formed themselves into associations, taking pattern from the *Essenes* and *Therapeutæ*.

§ 13. The causes of this institution are obvious. First, the Christians did not like an appearance of inferiority to the Greeks, Romans, and other nations; among whom there were

⁸ Athenagoras, *Apologia pro Christianis*, cap. 23, p. 129, ed. Oxon. and others.

⁹ See C. Salmasius, *Comment. in Ter-*

tullian. de Pallio, p. 7, 8. [Sam. Deyling, *Exercit. de Ascetis Vet. in Obscrv. Sacr.* l. iii. and Jos. Bingham, *Antiq. Eccles.* vol. iii. p. 3, &c. *Tr.*]

many philosophers and sages, who were distinguished from the vulgar by their dress and their whole mode of life, and who were held in high honour. Now among these philosophers, (as is well known,) none better pleased the Christians than the *Platonists* and *Pythagoreans*; who, it appears, recommended *two* modes of living; one, for philosophers, wishing to excel the rest of men in virtue, the other, for people engaged in the common affairs of life¹. The Platonists prescribed the following rule for philosophers: the mind of a wise man must be withdrawn, as far as possible, from the contagious influence of the body: and as the oppressive load of the body, and intercourse with men, are most adverse to this design, therefore, all sensual gratifications are to be avoided; the body is to be sustained, or rather mortified, with coarse and slender fare; solitude is to be sought for; and the mind is to be self-collected, and absorbed in contemplation, so as to be detached as much as possible from the body². Whoever lives in this manner, shall in the present life have converse with God; and, when freed from the burthen of the body, shall ascend without delay to the celestial mansions, and not need purgation, like the souls of other men. The grounds of this system lay in the peculiar sentiments entertained by this sect of philosophers and by their friends, respecting the *soul*, *demons*, *matter*, and the *universe*. And when these sentiments were embraced by the more learned Christians, the necessary consequences of them followed as a matter of course.

§ 14. What has been stated will excite less surprise, if it be remembered, that *Egypt* was the land in which this mode of life had its origin. For this country, from some law of nature, has always produced a greater number of gloomy and hypochondriac or melancholy persons than any other³; and it still does so. Here it was, that long before the Saviour's birth, not only the *Essenes* and *Therapeutæ*,—those Jewish sects composed of

¹ They made a distinction between living according to nature, (ζῆν κατὰ φύσιν,) and living above nature (ζῆν ὑπὲρ φύσιν). See Æneas Gazæus, in *Theophrasto*, p. 29, ed. Barthii. The former was the rule for *all* men; the latter only for philosophers who aimed at perfect virtue.

² Consult here, by all means, that

most distinguished Platonist, Porphyry, *περὶ ἀποχρῆς*, or, *on Abstinence from flesh*, lib. i. § 27 and 41, p. 22, 34, where he formally lays down rules for these duties of a philosopher.

³ See Bened. Maillet, *Description de l'Égypte*, tome ii. p. 57, &c. Paris, 1735, 4to.

persons affected with a morbid melancholy, or rather partially deranged,—had their chief residence; but many others also, that they might better please the gods, withdrew themselves, as by the instinct of nature, from commerce with men and from all the pleasures of life⁴. From Egypt, this mode of life passed into Syria and the neighbouring countries; which, in like manner, always abounded with unsociable and austere individuals⁵: and at last it was introduced from the East among the nations of Europe. Hence the numerous maladies which still deform the Christian world; hence the celibacy of the clergy; hence the numerous herds of monks; hence the two species of life, the *theoretical* and *mystical*; hence the many other things of a like nature, which we shall have occasion to mention in the progress of our work.

§ 15. Another error among the Christians, not indeed of equal extent, but a pernicious one, and productive of many evils, was the following. The Platonists and Pythagoreans deemed it not only lawful but also commendable to deceive and lie, for the sake of truth and piety⁶. The Jews living in Egypt learned from them this sentiment before the Christian era, as appears from many proofs. And from both, this vice early spread among the Christians. Of this no one will doubt, who calls to mind the numerous forgeries of books under the names of eminent men, the Sibylline verses⁷, and I know not

⁴ Herodotus, *Historiar.* lib. ii. p. 104, ed. Gronov. Epiphanius, *Expos. Fidei*, § 11. Opp. tom. ii. p. 1092. Tertullian, de *Exhortatione Castitatis*, cap. 13. Athanasius, *Vita Antonii*, Opp. tom. ii. p. 453.

⁵ Jo. Chardin, *Voyages en Perse*, tome iv. p. 197, ed. Amsterd. 1735, 4to.

⁶ [Mosheim, on this subject, in his *Comment. de Rebb. Christ.* &c. p. 231, refers us to his *Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia*, § 41, &c. Tr.]

⁷ [Concerning the Sibylline verses, which were composed about A. D. 138, J. A. Fabricius has treated largely, *Biblioth. Græca*, tom. i. The latest editor of the verses is Servat. Galliens, who has corrected the text, and added copious notes, Amsterd. 1689, 4to. He has subjoined the *Magie Oracles* ascribed to Zoroaster and others; in which are many things of Christian origin. That the Sibylline verses were fabricated by some

Christian, in order to bring idolaters to believe in the truth of Christianity, has been well shown by Dav. Blondell, among others; and with a very few exceptions, there is no learned man at the present day who thinks otherwise. Blondell's work, which is in French, was first published under the title, *Des Sibylles célébrées tant par l'Antiquité payenne, que par les saints Pères*, Charenton, 1649, 4to. Two years after the title was changed, doubtless to allure purchasers; *Traité de la Créance des Pères touchant l'Etat des ames après cette vie*, &c. à l'occasion de l'Ecrit attribué aux Sibylles, Charenton, 1651, 4to. That the pagans were indignant at this forgery, which they attributed to the Christians, appears from Origen, *contra Celsum*, lib. v. p. 272, ed. Spencer; Lactantius, *Instit. Divinor.* l. iv. c. 14; and Constantine the Great, *Oratio ad Sanctos*, in Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 230. Tr.]

what besides⁸, a large mass of which appeared in this age, and subsequently. I would not say that the orthodox Christians forged all the books of this character; on the contrary, it is probable that the greater part of them originated from the founders of the *Gnostic* sects. Yet, that the Christians who were free from heterodox views were not wholly free from this fault, is too clear to be denied.

§ 16. The more the boundaries of the church were enlarged, the greater was the number of vicious and bad men who thrust themselves into it; as may be proved by the many complaints and censures of the writers of this age. The well-known custom of excluding transgressors from the communion, was a barrier against the more flagrant and notorious crimes. Of all sins, those accounted the most heinous and the greatest, were these three, *murder*, *idolatry*, and *adultery*; which terms, however, must here be understood in the broadest sense. Those guilty of these crimes, in many churches, lost all hope of pardon; in others, they were again admitted after a long, severe, and painful probation⁹.

§ 17. It is worthy of particular notice, that this custom of excluding bad characters from the society of Christians, and of not receiving them back except upon good proof of a thorough inward change, was at first a simple process, and attended with very little formality; but by degrees the regulations for it were greatly amplified, and deformed by many rites borrowed especially from the discipline of the pagan mysteries¹. That it was proper for the Christian bishops to increase the restraints upon the licentiousness of transgression, will be readily granted by all who consider the circumstances of those times. But whether it was for the advantage of Christianity to borrow rules for this salutary ordinance from the enemies of the truth,

⁸ [That the books now circulated under the name of *Hermes*, and particularly the one called *Pemander*, were a Christian forgery, was first shown by Is. Casaubon, *Exercit. i. in Baronium*, § 18, p. 54, and afterwards by H. Conringius, Beausobre, Cudworth, Warburton, and many others. Some, however, suppose that the books were originally composed by Platonists; and afterwards interpolated and corrupted by some Christian. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* p. 230. *Tr.*]

⁹ In this manner, I think, we may reconcile the different opinions of learned men on this subject. See Jo. Morin, *de Disciplina Penitentiae*, lib. ix. cap. 19, p. 670, &c. Ja. Sirmond, *Historia Penitentiae publicae*, cap. i. Opp. tom. iv. p. 323, and the recent Dissertation of Jo. Aug. Orsi, *de Criminum capitalium per tria priora secula Absolutione*, Mediolani, 1730, 4to.

¹ See Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibliographice Antiquariae*, p. 397. Jo. Morin, *de Penitentia*, lib. i. cap. 15, 16, &c.

and thus to consecrate, as it were, a part of the pagan superstition, many persons very justly call in question. The more candid will appreciate the good *intention* of those who introduced this sort of rules and ceremonies; all beyond this they will ascribe to human weakness.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Ceremonies much increased.—§ 2. Reasons: I. A desire to enlarge the church.—§ 3. II. Hope that they would silence calumnies.—§ 4. III. Abuse of Jewish terms.—§ 5. IV. Imitation of the pagan mysteries.—§ 6. V. Mode of instructing by symbols.—§ 7. VI. Habits of the converts.—§ 8. The assemblies for worship.—§ 9. Contests about the time for Easter.—§ 10. Their importance.—§ 11. The Asiatics and the Romans, the principal parties.—§ 12. Celebration of the Lord's Supper.—§ 13. Baptism.

§ 1. It is certain, that to religious worship, both public and private, many rites were added, without necessity, and to the offence of sober and good men¹. For the chief cause of this, I should look at once to the perverseness of mankind; who are more delighted with the pomp and splendour of external forms, than with the true devotion of the heart, and who despise whatever does not gratify their eyes and ears². But other and additional causes may be mentioned, which were clear, undoubtedly, of any bad design, but not of indiscretion.

§ 2. *First*, there is good reason to suppose that Christian bishops multiplied sacred rites for the sake of rendering the Jews and the pagans more friendly to them. Both had been accustomed to numerous and splendid ceremonies from their infancy, and felt no doubt that in them was comprised a portion of religion. When, accordingly, they saw the new religion

¹ Tertullian, *Liber de Creatione*, Opp. p. 792, &c.

² [To illustrate the influence of splendid ceremonies on mankind, Dr. Maclaine here states, that "the late Lord Bolingbroke, being present at the elevation of

the host in the cathedral at Paris, expressed to a nobleman who stood near him his surprise, that the *king* of France should commit the performance of such an august and striking ceremony to *any subject*." *Tr.*]

without such things, they thought it too simple, and therefore despised it. To obviate this objection, the rulers of the Christian churches deemed it proper for them to worship God in public with some increase of ceremony³.

§ 3. *Secondly*, the simplicity of the worship which Christians offered to the Deity, gave occasion to certain calumnies maintained both by the Jews and the pagan priests. The Christians were pronounced *Atheists*, because they were destitute of temples, altars, victims, priests, and all that pomp in which the vulgar suppose the essence of religion to consist. For unenlightened persons are prone to estimate religion by what meets their eyes. To silence this accusation, the Christian doctors thought it necessary to introduce some external rites, which would strike the senses of the people; so that they could maintain themselves really to possess all those things of which Christians were charged with being destitute, though under different forms.

§ 4. *Thirdly*, it is well known, that in the books of the New Testament, various parts of the Christian religion are expressed in terms borrowed from the Jewish laws, or are in some measure compared with the Mosaic rites. This mode of expressing their thoughts the Christian doctors and writers not only imitated, but also extended still further. In this there was little to censure. But in time, either from inconsideration, or from ignorance, or from policy, the greater part maintained that such phraseology was not figurative, but proper, and accordant with the nature of the things. The bishops were at first innocently called *high priests*, and the presbyters, *priests*, and the

³ It will not be unsuitable to transcribe here a very apposite passage, which I accidentally met with in Gregory Nyssen's life of Gregory Thaumaturgus, in the *Works of Thaumaturgus*, as published by Vossius, p. 312, who gives the Latin only:—Cum animadvertisset (Gregorius), quod ob corporeas delectationes et voluptates simplex et imperitum vulgus in simulacrorum cultus errore permaneret—permisit eis, ut in memoriam ac recordationem sanctorum martyrum sese oblectarent et in lœtitiis effunderentur, quod successu temporis aliquando futurum esset, ut sua sponte ad honestiorem et accuratiorem vitæ rationem transirent.—When Gregory perceived that the ignorant and simple mul-

titude persisted in their idolatry, on account of the sensible pleasures and delights it afforded,—he allowed them in celebrating the memory of the holy martyrs, to indulge themselves, and give a loose to pleasure, (i. e. as the thing itself, and both what precedes and what follows, place beyond all controversy, he allowed them at the sepulchres of the martyrs, on their feast days, to dance, to use sports, to indulge conviviality, and to do all the things that the worshippers of idols were accustomed to do in their temples on their festival days,) hoping, that in process of time they would spontaneously come over to a more becoming and more correct manner of life.

deacons, *Levites*. But in a little time, those to whom these titles were given abused them, maintaining that they stood in the same place, enjoyed the same dignity, and possessed the same rights that had belonged to those who bore these titles under the Mosaic dispensation. Hence the origin of *first-fruits*, and next of *tithes*; hence more *splendid garments*, and many other things. In like manner, the comparison of the Christian *oblations* with the Jewish *victims* and *sacrifices*, produced many unnecessary rites, and by degrees corrupted the very doctrine of the holy Supper, which was converted, sooner, in fact, than one would think, into a *sacrifice*.

§ 5. *Fourthly*, among the Greeks and the people of the East, nothing was held more sacred than what were called the *Mysteries*. This circumstance led the Christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to say, that *they* also had similar *mysteries*, or certain holy rites concealed from the vulgar; and they not only applied the *terms* used in the pagan mysteries to Christian institutions, particularly baptism and the Lord's Supper; but they gradually introduced also the *rites* which were designated by those terms⁴. This practice originated in the eastern provinces: and thence, after the times of *Adrian* (who first introduced the Grecian mysteries among the Latins⁵), it spread among the Christians of the West. A large part, therefore, of the Christian observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries.

§ 6. *Fifthly*, many ceremonies took their rise from the custom of the Egyptians, and of almost all the eastern nations, of conveying instruction by *images*, *actions*, and sensible *signs*. The Christian doctors, therefore, thought it likely to help their

⁴ Examples are given by Is. Casaubon, *Exercit.* xvi. in *Annales Baronii*, p. 388. J. A. Tollius, *Insignibus veteris Italici*, Notes, 151. 163. E. Z. Spanheim, *Notes to his French translation of Julian's Cæsars*, p. 133, 134. Dav. Clarkson, *Discourse on Liturgies*, p. 36. 42, 43, and others.

⁵ Spartianus, *Hadrian*, c. 13, p. 15, ed. Obrecht. [Spartian speaks only of the Eleusinian Mysteries, into which Adrian was initiated at Athens. These it may be that Adrian first introduced among the Latins; yet he was not the first Roman initiated in them.—That

some mysteries had before this time been introduced into the Roman worship, appears from the *Epistles of Cicero to Atticus*, l. v. 21, end; lib. vi. 1, end; l. xv. 25. Gronovius, indeed, understands these (*mysteria Romana*) to be the worship of the goddess Bona Dea. See his *Obsere.* l. iv. c. 9. But on this worship, no male person might attend; and I see not why Cicero should inquire so particularly of his friend, (as he does,) about the time of these mysteries, if they were nothing but the worship of a deity, in which none but females ever bore any part. *Schl.*]

cause, if things which men must know in order to salvation, were placed, as it were, *before the eyes* of the unreflecting multitude, who with difficulty contemplate abstract truths. The new converts were to be taught, that those are *born again* who are initiated by baptism into the Christian worship, and that they ought to exhibit in their conduct the innocence of infants; therefore *milk* and *honey*, the common food of little children, were given to them. Those who obtained admission to the kingdom of *Christ*, from being the servants of the devil, became the Lord's freed men; and, like newly-enlisted soldiers, swore to obey their commander. And, therefore, certain rites were borrowed from military usages, and from the forms of manumission⁶.

§ 7. *Lastly*, not to be tedious; whoever considers that the Christians were collected from among the Jews and from the pagan nations, who were accustomed, from their earliest years, to various ceremonies and superstitious rites; and that the habits of early life are very hard to be laid aside, will perceive that it would have been little short of a miracle if nothing corrupt and debasing had found its way into the Christian church. For example, nearly all the people of the East, before the Christian era, were accustomed to worship with their faces directed towards the sun rising. For they all believed that God, whom they supposed to resemble light, or rather to be light, and whom they included within certain bounds, had his residence in that part of the heavens where the sun rises. Those of them, indeed, who became Christians rejected this error, but the custom that originated from it, which was very ancient and universally prevalent, they retained. Nor even to this age has its abrogation been found practicable. For the same cause many Jewish rites originated, which are still religiously maintained by numbers of Christians, especially by those who live in eastern countries⁷.

§ 8. The rites themselves I shall state only summarily; for this extensive subject deserves to be considered by itself, and cannot be fully discussed in the narrow limits of our work. The Christians assembled for the worship of God in *private*

⁶ See Edm. Merill, *Observations*, lib. iii. cap. 3. [C. G. Schwartz, *Diss. de ritibus quibusdam formalisque a manumissione ad S. Baptismum translatis*, Altdorf. 1738, and J. G. Zentgraf's *Diss.* at Jena,

under Dr. Walch, 1749, *de Ritibus Baptismalibus sæculi secundi*, Schl.]

⁷ See Jo. Spencer, *de Legibus ritualibus Ebraeor.* Prolegom. p. 9, ed. Cantab. and all those who have explained the

dwelling-houses, in *caves*, and in the places where the dead were buried. They met on the *first day* of the week; and in many places also on the *seventh day*, which was the Jewish sabbath. Most of them, likewise, held sacred the fourth and sixth, the former being the day on which our Saviour was betrayed, and the latter, that on which he was crucified. The *hours* of the day allotted to these meetings varied according to times and circumstances; most of them could assemble only in the *evening*, or *before the dawn* of day in the morning. When the Christians were assembled, *prayers* were recited; (the purport of which *Tertullian* gives us⁸;) the holy *Scriptures* were read⁹; short *discourses* on Christian duties were addressed to the people; *hymns* were sung; and at last, the *Lord's Supper* and the love-feasts were celebrated, the oblations of the people affording them the materials¹.

§ 9. The Christians of this century consecrated anniversary festivals, in memory of the Saviour's death and resurrection, and of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles. The day in remembrance of *Christ's* dying and expiating the sins of men, was called the *Passover*², because they supposed that *Christ* was crucified on the same day in which the Jews kept their *Passover*. But in observing this festival, the Christians of Asia Minor differed from other Christians, and especially from those of Rome³. Both fasted during what was called the *great*

rites and usages of the oriental Christians.

⁸ *Tertullian, Apologeticum*, cap. 39.

⁹ [That other religious books, besides the canonical Scriptures, were read in several churches, appears from *Eusebius, Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. 23, and iii. 3; who informs us, that the first Epistle of Clement, and that of Soter, bishops of Rome, were publicly read in the church of Corinth; as was the *Shepherd* of Hermas, in very many churches. *Tr.*]

¹ [Pliny (*Epistolar.* l. x. Ep. 97,) gives some account of the public worship of the Christians, in the beginning of this century: and Justin Martyr, near the close of that *Apology* which he presented to Antoninus Pius, A. D. 150, gives a more full and authentic account. (Already extracted, Cent. i. pt. ii. ch. 4.) Justin makes no mention here of singing, as a part of the public worship of Christians. But Pliny in his *Epistle* assures us: "Quod essent soliti stato

die ante lucem convenire; carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem." and both the New Testament, and all antiquity, recognise singing as a part of Christian worship. *Tr.*]

² [Or Easter (*Pascha*). *Tr.*]

³ [There was, probably, a large proportion of converts from Judaism among them, and these men were anxious to engraft, as far as possible, the Mosaic ritual upon their new profession of Christianity. Within Palestine itself a different spirit prevailed, the church of Cæsarea, and even that of Jerusalem, conforming to the Roman usage in celebrating Easter; but the former of these churches consisted chiefly of converts from heathenism, and the latter had assumed very much of a Gentile character under Adrian. See Rose's translation of Neander's *History of the Christian Religion and Church during the three first centuries*, Lond. 1831, p. 342. *Ed.*]

week, that in which *Christ* died; and in remembrance of the last supper of our Saviour, they held a sacred feast or ate the paschal lamb, just as the Jews did; which feast, as well as the time of *Christ's* death, they denominated the *Passover*. Now the Asiatic Christians held their paschal feast on the fourteenth day, or full moon, of the first Jewish month, which was the very time on which the Jews ate their *Passover*; and on the third day after this supper, they kept the memorial of *Christ's* triumph over death, or of his resurrection. This custom they said they had received from the apostles *John* and *Philip*; and they moreover supported it by the example of *Christ* himself, who celebrated his paschal feast at the same time with the Jews. But the other Christians put off their *Passover*, that is, their paschal feast, until the evening preceding the festal day, sacred to *Christ's* resurrection⁴, and thus connected the memorial of *Christ's* death with that of his resurrection. And they cited *Peter* and *Paul* as authorities for their custom.

§ 10. The Asiatic custom of celebrating the *Passover* had two great inconveniences, which appeared intolerable to the other Christians, and especially to the Romans. First, by holding their sacred feast on the very day on which they supposed *Christ* ate the paschal lamb with his disciples, they interrupted the *fast* of the great week, which appeared to the other Christians to fall little short of a crime. Again, as they always kept the memorial of *Christ's* rising from the dead, on the *third day* after their paschal supper, it unavoidably happened that they more commonly kept, on some other day of the week than the first or Sunday, called the Lord's-day, the festival of *Christ's* resurrection, which in after times was called, and is now called, the *Passover*, or *Easter*. Now the greater part of the Christians deemed it wrong to consecrate any other than the Lord's-day, in remembrance of *Christ's* resurrection. Hence great contention frequently arose from this difference between the Asiatic and the other Christians. In the reign of *Antoninus Pius*, about the middle of this century, *Anicetus*, bishop of Rome, and *Polycarp*, bishop of Smyrna, discussed this question with great care at Rome⁵. But the Asiatics could not be

⁴ [Or Saturday evening. *Tr.*]

⁵ It does not appear, that *Polycarp's* visit to Rome was for the particular purpose of debating the paschal ques-

tion. That subject seems merely to have been discussed among others. But although *Anicetus* and *Polycarp* wholly failed of convincing each other,

induced by any considerations to give up their custom, which they believed to be handed down to them from *St. John*⁶.

§ 11. Near the close of the century, *Victor*, bishop of Rome, thought it necessary, that the Asiatic Christians should be compelled, by laws and decrees, to follow the rule adopted by the greater part of the Christian world. Accordingly, after ascertaining the opinions of foreign bishops, he admonished the Asiatic bishops, in an imperious letter, to follow the example of other Christians in keeping Easter. They replied with spirit, by *Polycrates*, bishop of Ephesus, that they would not depart from the holy institution of their ancestors. Irritated by this decision, *Victor* excluded them from his communion, and from that of his church⁷, (not from that of the universal church, which he had not power to do,) that is, he pronounced them unworthy to be called his brethren. The progress of this disagreement was checked by *Irenæus*, bishop of Lyons, in letters wisely composed, directed to *Victor* and others, and by the Asiatic bishops, who wrote a long letter in their own justification. And thus both parties retained their respective customs, until the council of Nice, in the fourth century, abrogated the Asiatic usage⁸.

§ 12. When the Christians celebrated the Lord's Supper, which they were accustomed to do chiefly on Sundays, they consecrated a part of the bread and wine of the oblations, by certain prayers, which the bishop of the congregation uttered. The wine was mixed with water; the bread was divided into small pieces. Portions of the consecrated bread and wine

the difference was kindly borne on both sides, and the two prelates parted with mutual esteem. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 24, ed. Vales. i. 157. *Ed.*]

⁶ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. c. 14, and l. v. c. 24.

⁷ [Victor appears rather to have threatened this, and taken measures for effecting it, than actually to have done it. Eusebius says, ἀπορίμην ὡς ἑτεροδόξους τῆς κοινῆς ἐνότητος περᾶται, (*Hist. Eccl.* 156,) endeavours to cut them off from communion as heterodox. He might have been restrained by the spirited remonstrances of those who agreed with him in opinion, but had greater temper and discretion. See the note of De Valois on this passage of Eusebius, *Annotat.* i. 93. *Ed.*]

⁸ What is here stated briefly is more fully explained in my *Comment. de Rebus Christianor. ante Constantinum M.* p. 435, &c. I there said, p. 439, that Peter Faydit saw the mistake in the common accounts of this controversy. But my memory failed me. On consulting the book, I find that he treats of the controversy indeed, but he misunderstood the precise subject of it.—The venerable Heumann's tract on this controversy, is republished in the *Sylloge* of his minor works.—[Dr. Mosheim thinks the true statement of this controversy is that which he has given; and that many writers have mistaken the points at issue, from not distinguishing between the ancient and the more modern application of the term *Passover* or *Easter*. *Tr.*]

were commonly sent to the absent and the sick, in testimony of fraternal affection towards them⁹. There is much evidence that this most holy rite was regarded as necessary to the attainment of salvation: and I therefore dare not accuse of error, those who believe that the sacred supper was, in this century, given to infants¹. Of the *love-feasts*, the notice before given may be sufficient.

§ 13. Twice a year, namely, at *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*², baptism was publicly administered by the *bishop*, or by the *presbyters* acting by his command and authority. The candidates for it were immersed wholly in water, with invocation of the sacred Trinity, according to the Saviour's precept, after they had repeated what they called the *Creed*³, and had renounced all their sins and transgressions, and especially the *devil* and his *pomp*. The baptized were signed with the cross, anointed, commended to God by prayer and imposition of hands, and finally directed to taste some milk and honey⁴. The reasons for these rites must be sought in what has already been said respecting the causes of ceremonies in general. Adults were to prepare their minds expressly, by prayers, fasting, and other devotional exercises. *Sponsors* or *godfathers* were, as I apprehend, first employed for adults, and afterwards for children likewise⁵.

⁹ See Henry Rixner, *de Ritibus veterum Christianorum. circa Eucharistiam*, p. 155, &c.

¹ See Jo. Fr. Mayer, *de Eucharistia Infantum*; and Peter Zornius, *Historia Eucharistie Infantum*, Berol. 1736, 8vo.

² *Festis Paschalis et Pentecostes dictus*. See W. Wall, *History of Infant Baptism*, vol. i. p. 277. 279, of the Latin edition by Schlosser; Jos. Vicecomes, *de Ritibus Baptismi*, Paris, 1618, 8vo.

³ *Symbolum, quod vocabant*.

⁴ See especially Tertullian, *de Baptismo*, [and respecting the honey and milk, Tertullian, *de Corona*; and Clemens Alex. *Pædag.* l. i. c. 6. *Schl.*]

⁵ See Ger. van Mastricht, *de Susceptoribus Infantum ex Baptismo*, edit. 2nd, Frankf. 1727, 4to. He thinks sponsors were used for children, and not for adults; p. 15. See also W. Wall, *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, vol. i. p. 69. 474, &c. — [The manner of receiving new converts into the churches, about the year 150, is thus minutely described by Justin Martyr, in his (so called) second *Apology*, towards the conclusion: "In

what manner we dedicate ourselves to God, after being renewed by Christ, we will now explain: lest, by omitting this, we should seem to dissemble in our statement. Those who believe and are persuaded that the things we teach and inculcate are true, and who profess ability thus to live, are directed to pray, with fasting, and to ask of God the forgiveness of their former sins; we also fasting and praying with them. Then we conduct them to a place where there is water; and they are regenerated [baptized], in the manner in which we have been regenerated [baptized]; for they receive a washing with water, in the name of the Father of all, the Lord God, and of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. For Christ said, *Except ye be regenerated, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven*." — "This washing is likewise called *illumination*; because the minds of those who have learned these things are enlightened. And whoever is enlightened, is washed in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate;

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS SEPARATIONS OR HERESIES.

§ 1. Discord among the Jewish Christians.—§ 2. Hence the Nazarenes and Ebionites.—§ 3. Their impiety.—§ 4. The sects originating from the oriental philosophy.—§ 5. Elxai and Elcesaites.—§ 6. Saturninus; his extravagances.—§ 7. Cerdo and Marcion.—§ 8. Bardesanes.—§ 9. Tatian and the Eneerites.—§ 10. Peculiar sentiments of the Egyptian Gnostics.—§ 11. Basilides.—§ 12. His enormities.—§ 13. His moral principles.—§ 14. Carpocrates.—§ 15. Valentinus.—§ 16. His extravagances.—§ 17. Various sects of Valentinians.—§ 18. The minor sects of Valentinians.—§ 19. The Ophites.—§ 20. Monarchians and Patropassians.—§ 21. Theodotus, Artemon.—§ 22. Hermogenes.—§ 23. The illiterate sects. Montanus.—§ 24. The success of Montanus and his doctrine.

§ 1. AMONG the Christian sects that arose in this century, the first place is due to those Jewish Christians, whose zeal for the Mosaic law severed them from the other believers in *Christ*¹. The rise of this sect took place in the reign of *Adrian*. For, when this emperor had wholly destroyed Jerusalem a second

and in the name of the Holy Spirit, who, by the prophets, foretold all that relates to Christ.”—“And after thus washing the convinced and consenting person, we conduct him to where the brethren, as we call them, are assembled; and there offer our united supplications, with earnestness, both for ourselves and for the enlightened person, and for all others every where: that we may conduct ourselves as becomes those who have received the truth, and by our deeds prove ourselves good citizens, and observers of what is commanded us: so that we may be saved with an eternal salvation. And on ending our prayers, we salute each other with a kiss. Then there is placed before the President of the brethren, bread, and a cup of water and wine; which he taking, offers praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and gives thanks at great length, that such blessings are vouchsafed us;

and when he ends the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present respond, *Amen*. Now the word *amen*, in the Hebrew tongue, signifies *so be it*. And after the President has given thanks, and all the people have uttered the response, those whom we call Deacons distribute to every one present, to partake of the bread and the wine and water, over which thanks were given: and to those not present, the Deacons carry it. And this food is called by us the *Eucharist*; which it is unlawful for any one to partake of, unless he believes the things taught by us to be true, and has been washed with the washing for the remission of sins in regeneration, and lives according to what Christ has taught.” *Tr.*]

¹ [“This heresy is scarcely noticed by Tertullian.” (Bp. Kaye’s *Tertullian*, 470.) For fuller information respecting sects of this class, Rose’s *Neander*, ii. 4, may be advantageously consulted. *Ed.*]

time, and enacted severe laws against the Jews, the greater part of the Christians living in Palestine, that they might not be confounded with Jews, as they had been, laid aside the Mosaic ceremonies, and chose one *Mark*, who was a foreigner and not a Jew, for their bishop. This procedure was very offensive to those among them whose attachment to the Mosaic rites was too strong to be eradicated. They therefore separated from their brethren, and formed a distinct society in Perea, a part of Palestine, and in the neighbouring regions; and among them the Mosaic law retained all its dignity unimpaired².

§ 2. This body of people, who would unite *Moses* and *Christ*, was again divided into two classes, differing widely in their opinions and customs, the *Nazarenes* and the *Ebionites*. The former are not reckoned by the ancient Christians among heretics³, but the latter are placed among those sects which subverted the foundations of religion. Both sects used a history of *Christ* or a *Gospel*, which was different from our *Gospels*⁴. The word *Nazarene* was not the name of a *sect*, but was equivalent to the word *Christian*. For those who bore the title of *Christians* among the Greeks, were by the Jews called *Nazarenes*, which was far from disagreeable to them. Those who retained, after separating from their brethren, this first name for our Lord's disciples, being the very one imposed on them by the Jews, believed *Christ* to be born of a virgin, and to be in some way united with the divine nature⁵. And although they would never discard the ceremonies prescribed by *Moses*, yet they did not obtrude them upon the Gentile Christians. They rejected, moreover, the additions made to the

² See Sulpitius Severus, *Historia Sacra*, l. ii. c. 31, p. 245, &c. [p. 381, ed. Hornii, 1647. He says, "Adrian stationed a regiment of soldiers as a constant guard to prevent all Jews from entering Jerusalem; which was advantageous to the Christian faith; because, at that time, nearly all [the Jewish Christians] believed in Christ as God, yet with an observance of the law." Tr.]

³ The first that ranked the Nazarenes among the heretics was Epiphanius, a writer of the fourth century, of no great fidelity, or accuracy of judgment. [A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 619, 620, thinks the Nazarenes, de-

scribed by Epiphanius, were descendants of the Ebionites, who had now imbibed some Gnostic principles. The names Ebionites and Nazarenes are often confounded, both by ancients and moderns. Tr.]

⁴ See J. A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryph. N. T.* tom. i. p. 355, &c. and Mosheim, *Vindiciæ, contra Tolandii Nazarenam*, p. 112, &c. [Jones on the Canon of the New Test. vol. i. and the authors of Introductions to the New Test. Tr.]

⁵ ["The Nazarenes do not seem to have allowed the pre-existence of Christ." Hey's *Lectures*, i. 266. Ed.]

Mosaic ritual, by the doctors of the law and the Pharisees⁶. It is therefore easy to see why the other Christians in general judged more favourably of them.

§ 3. Whether the *Ebionites* derived their name from a man [called *Ebion*], or were so denominated on account of their poverty, either in regard to property or sentiment, is uncertain⁷. But they were much worse than the Nazarenes. For though they supposed *Christ* to be an ambassador of God, and endowed with divine power, yet they conceived him to be a man, born in the ordinary course of nature, from *Joseph* and *Mary*. They maintained that the ceremonial law of *Moses* must be observed, not by the Jews only, but also by all who wished to obtain salvation; and, therefore, *St. Paul*, as the most strenuous opposer of the law, they viewed with abhorrence. Nor were they satisfied with the mere rites which *Moses* appointed, but also observed, with equal veneration, the superstitious rites of their ancestors, and the customs of the Pharisees, which were added to the law⁸.

§ 4. These little and obscure sects were not very detrimental to the Christian cause. Much greater disturbance was produced by those whose founders explained the doctrines of

⁶ See Mich. le Quien, *Adnotatt. ad Damascenum*, tom. i. p. 82, 83, and his *Diss. de Nazarenis et eorum fide*; which is the seventh of his Dissertations subjoined to his edition of the *Works of Damascenus*. [C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 101, &c. *Schl.*]

⁷ See Fabricius, *ad Philastr. de heresibus*, p. 81. Thom. Ittig, *de Heresibus Aeri Apostolici*, [also note¹ on cent. i. pt. ii. ch. v. p. 128, and A. Neander, *Kirchenesch.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 612, &c. *Tr.*—"They are more than once mentioned by Tertullian, who always speaks of them as having received their appellation from their founder, Ebion." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 471. "Tertullian is the first who makes mention of a founder, named Ebion, and others have followed him in this account. Better informed writers, such as Irenæus and Origen, know of no such person; and it is clear that the invention of such a person arose from the not understanding the name of Ebionite. Origen gives us the proper derivation of the term, namely, from the Hebrew, *Ebion*, poor."

(Rose's *Neander*, ii. 10.) The Ebionites made a strict profession of poverty, esteeming the world and all its allurements as the property of Satan, and themselves, accordingly, obliged to relinquish every thing earthly beyond the barest requirements of nature. *Ed.*

⁸ Irenæus, *contra Hæreses*, lib. i. cap. 26. Epiphanius treats largely of the Ebionites in his *Hæres.* xxx. But he is worthy of no credit; for he acknowledges (§ 3, p. 127, and § 14, p. 141,) that he has joined the Sampseans and the Elcesaites with the Ebionites, and that the first Ebionites did not hold the errors which he attributes to the sect.—[The correctness of Epiphanius, as a historian, is often called in question; and perhaps justly. But if the term Ebionites designated a variety of minor sects, all of them Jewish Christians; and if some of these sects had, in the fourth century, imbibed Gnostic sentiments, unknown to the original Ebionites, then Epiphanius may here be entirely correct, which others suppose to be the fact. See Neander, as cited above, Note³. *Tr.*]

Christianity agreeably to the precepts of oriental philosophy respecting the origin of evil⁹. These latter sects, having lived in obscurity, and made little noise previously to this century, came forth into public view during the reign of *Adrian*¹, and gathered churches of considerable magnitude in various countries. A long catalogue of these semi-Christian bodies might be extracted from ancient monuments: but of the greater part of them we know no more than their names; and perhaps many of them differed only in name from each other. Those which acquired notoriety beyond others, may be divided into two classes. The first class originated in Asia, and maintained the philosophy of the East in regard to the origin of the universe (if I may so say), pure and entire: the other class, which was formed in Egypt, and by Egyptians, mingled with that philosophy many of their country's prodigies and precepts. The systems of the former were more simple and intelligible; those of the latter were much more complicated, and more difficult of explication.

§ 5. The first place in the Asiatic class, seems to belong to *Elxai*, a Jew, who is said to have founded the sect of the *Elcesaites*, in the reign of *Trajan*². Though he was a Jew, and worshipped one God, and revered *Moses*, yet he corrupted the religion of his fathers by many false notions derived from the philosophy and superstition of the orientals; and, after the example of the *Essenes*, expounded the Mosaic law according to the dictates of reason, or, in other words, made it an allegory. But *Epiphanius*, who had read one of *Elxai's* books, acknowledges himself in doubt, whether the *Elcesaites* should be reckoned among the Christian sects, or among the Jewish. In his book *Elxai* mentions *Christ*, and speaks honourably of him; but he does not explain himself so as to make it manifest whether *Jesus of Nazareth* was the Christ of whom he speaks³.

⁹ ["Neither he (Tertullian) nor any other of the early Fathers, appears to have thought that the heretics derived their notions from the oriental philosophy. On the contrary, Tertullian repeatedly charges them with borrowing from Pythagoras, and Plato, and other Greek philosophers. In like manner, Irenæus affirms that Valentinus was indebted for his succession of *Æons* to the

Theogonies of the Greek poets." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 472. *Ed.*]

¹ Clemens Alex. *Stromat.* l. vii. c. 17, p. 898. Cyprian, *Epist.* lxxv. p. 141, and others.

² ["*Elxai* appears to have been entirely unknown to Tertullian." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 473. *Ed.*]

³ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vi. c. 38. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* xix. § 3, p. 41.

§ 6. If no account be taken of *Elxai*, *Saturninus* of Antioch will justly stand at the head of this class: at least he lived earlier than all the other *Gnostic* heresiarchs⁴. He supposed *two first causes* of all things, the *good God*, and *matter*, which is in its nature evil, and subject to a Lord. The world and the first men were created by seven angels, that is, by the rulers of the seven planets, without the knowledge of God, and against the will of the Lord of matter. But God approved of the work when it was completed, imparted rational souls to the men who before had only animal life, and divided the entire world into seven parts, which he subjected to the seven creators, of whom the God of the Jews was one, reserving, however, the supreme power to himself. To the good beings formed, the men, that is, possessed of wise and good souls, the Lord of matter opposed another sort of men, to whom he imparted a malignant soul. And hence the difference between good and bad men, which is so visible. After the creators of the world had revolted from the supreme God, he sent down *Christ* from heaven to our globe, clothed not with a real body, but with the shadow of one, that he might destroy the kingdom of the Lord of matter, and show good souls the way of returning back to God. But this way is difficult and harsh. For souls that would mount up to God, when the frame dissolves, must be prepared by abstinence from flesh, wine, marriage, and every other thing which either invigorates the body, or delights the senses. *Saturninus* taught in Syria, which was his native country, and especially at Antioch; and he drew many after him, by a great show of virtue⁵.

Theodoret, *Fabul. Hæret.* lib. ii. c. 7, p. 221. [Of these *Elocaites*, who were also called *Sampsæans*, every thing afforded by antiquity, that is important, has been collected by C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzererey*, vol. i. p. 587, &c. He justly accounts them enthusiasts. *Schl.*]

⁴ [Having taught his doctrine in the reign of Adrian. *Tr.*]

⁵ Irenæus, l. i. c. 24. Eusèb. *Hist. Eccl.* l. iv. c. 7. Epiphân. *Hæres.* xxiii. Theodoret, *Fabul. Hæret.* l. i. c. 2, and the other writers on the heresies. [Among the modern writers, see Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 336, &c. C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzererey*, vol. i. p. 274, &c. Ittig, *de Hæresiarch.*

secul. ii. c. 1. Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. p. 215. *Tr.*—"The seven star-spirits," as Neander calls the creating angels, "being stationed between the realms of light and those of darkness, united in a design, according to Saturninus, to win from the regions of darkness a land in which they could establish an independent kingdom. Thus arose the earth; but when it was created, its architects had the mortification of seeing that no more than a faint gleam of light from the celestial regions shone upon it here and there. To secure more of this, they formed a being cast in the image of that luminous form which played before them. Their workmanship, however, could not

§ 7. In the same class of Asiatic Gnostics, must be placed *Cerdo*, a Syrian⁶, and *Marcion*, the son of a bishop of Pontus⁷. The history of these men is obscure and uncertain. It appears, however, that they began to establish their sect at Rome; that *Cerdo* taught his principles there before the arrival of *Marcion*; that *Marcion*, failing to obtain some office in the church at Rome, from his own misconduct, went over to the party of *Cerdo*, and with great success propagated their tenets over the world. In the manner of the orientals *Marcion* taught that there are *two first causes* of all things, the one perfectly good, the other perfectly evil. Between these two deities, is interposed the Architect of this lower world, which men inhabit, and who is the God and lawgiver of the Jews. His nature is neither perfectly good, nor perfectly evil, but mixed, or as *Marcion* expressed it, he is *just*; and therefore can dispense punishments as well as rewards. The author of evil and the Creator of the world are perpetually at war. Each wishes to be worshipped as God, and to subject the inhabitants of the whole globe to himself. The Jews are the subjects of the Creator of the world, who is a very powerful spirit; the other nations, which worship many gods, are under the author of evil. Each is an oppressor of rational souls, and holds them in bondage. In order, therefore, to end this war, and give freedom to the souls which are of divine origin, the supreme God sent among the Jews *Jesus Christ*, who is of a nature very similar to himself, or his Son, clothed with the appearance or shadow of a body, to render him visible, with commission to destroy both

even stand upright, until the Supreme God, compassionating its helpless condition, breathed into it a spark of his own divine nature. Thus originated man as he really is, a being not only created after the most exalted model, but also kindly endued from above with a power of looking upwards in life, and of mounting thither after death." Rose's *Neander*, ii. 107. "Of Saturninus, the name occurs but once in our author's (Tertullian's) writings. He is there described as a disciple of Menander, who was himself a disciple of Simon Magus." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 474. *Ed.*]

⁶ ["Of *Cerdo*, Tertullian only states that Marcion borrowed many notions from him." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 474. *Ed.*]

⁷ ["From various notices scattered

over Tertullian's writings, we may collect that Marcion was a native of Pontus, that he flourished during the reign of Antoninus Pius, and the pontificate of Eleutherius; being originally in communion with the church at Rome; that he was a man fond of novelties, by the publication of which he unsettled the faith of the weaker brethren, and was in consequence more than once ejected from the congregation; that he afterwards became sensible of his errors, and expressed a wish to be reconciled to the church; and that his wish was granted, on condition that he should bring back with him those whom he had perverted by his doctrines. He died, however, before he was formally restored to its communion." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 475. *Ed.*]

the kingdom of the world's Creator, and that of the evil principle, and to bring souls back to God. He was assailed both by the prince of darkness and by the God of the Jews, or the world's Creator; but they were unable to hurt him, because he had only the appearance of a body. Whoever, according to *his* prescriptions, shall abstract their minds from sensible objects, and renouncing as well the laws of the God of the Jews as those of the prince of darkness, shall turn wholly to the supreme God, at the same time subduing and mortifying their bodies by fasting and other means, shall, after death, ascend to the celestial mansions. The moral discipline which *Marcion* prescribed to his followers was, as the nature of the system required, very austere and rigorous. For he condemned marriages, wine, flesh, and whatever is grateful and pleasant to the body. *Marcion* had numerous followers; among whom, *Lucan* or *Lucian*, *Severus*, *Blastes*, and others, but especially *Apelles*⁸, are said to have deviated in some respects from the opinions of their master, and to have established new sects⁹.

§ 8. *Bardesanes* and *Tatian* are commonly supposed to have been of the school of *Valentinus* the Egyptian, but erroneously; for their systems differ in many respects from that of the *Valentinians*, and come nearer to the oriental principle of two first causes of all things. *Bardesanes* was a Syrian of Edessa, a man of great acumen, and distinguished for his many learned productions. Seduced by love of the oriental philosophy, he placed in opposition to the supreme God, who is absolute goodness, a prince of darkness, who is the author of all evil. The supreme God created the world free from all evil, and formed men with celestial souls, and subtle ethereal bodies. When,

⁸ ["*Lucan* is once mentioned by *Tertullian* as holding the opinion, that neither the soul nor the body would rise again, but a sort of third substance." Bp. *Kaye's Tertullian*, 505. *Apelles* is frequently mentioned by *Tertullian*, who taxes him with immorality; but *Rhodon*, who lived at the beginning of the third century, and who was hostile to him, says that his good conduct earned him general respect. He differed from his master as to *Christ's* human body, which he considered to have been real, though not born of the *Virgin Mary*, but brought down from the stars. It was, therefore, flesh, although not the ordinary flesh of

men. *Rose's Neander*, ii. 135. Bp. *Kaye's Tertullian*, 507. Ed.]

⁹ Besides the common writers on the heresies, as *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret*, &c. see *Tertullian's* five *Books against Marcion*; and the *Poem against Marcion*, also in five books, which is ascribed to *Tertullian*; and the *Dialogue against the Marcionites*, which is ascribed to *Origen*. Among the modern writers, see *Massuet*, the editor of *Irenæus*, *Tillemont*, *Is. de Beausobre*, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, tom. ii. p. 69, &c. [C. W. F. Walch, *Histoire der Ketzereien*, vol. i. p. 484—537. Mosheim, *de Ribus Christ.* &c. p. 401—410. A. Neander,

however, the prince of darkness had induced the first men to sin, God permitted the author of all evil to inclose them in gross bodies formed out of sinful matter, and also to corrupt the world, in order that men might suffer for their iniquity. Hence the struggle between reason and concupiscence in man. *Jesus*, therefore, descended from the celestial regions, clothed, not with a real, but with a celestial and ethereal body, and taught men to subdue their depraved bodies, and to free themselves from the bondage of vicious matter, by abstinence, by meditation, and by fasting; and whoever will do so, on the dissolution of the body, shall ascend to the mansions of the blessed, clothed in the ethereal vehicles, or celestial bodies, which properly belong to them. *Bardesanes* afterwards returned to sounder sentiments; but his sect long survived in Syria¹.

§ 9. *Tatian*, by birth an Assyrian, a distinguished and learned man, and disciple of *Justin Martyr*, was more noted among the ancients for his austere moral principles, which were rigid beyond measure, than for the speculative errors or dogmas which he proposed as articles of faith to his followers². Yet it appears from credible witnesses, that he held *matter* to be the source of all evil, and therefore recommended the abhorrence and the mortification of the body; that he supposed the Creator of the world and the true God to be not one and the same being; that he denied to our Saviour a real body; and corrupted Christianity with other doctrines of the oriental philosophers. His followers, who were numerous, were sometimes called from him, *Tatiani*, or *Tatianists*; but more frequently were designated by names indicative of their austere morals. For, as they discarded all the external comforts and conveniences of life, and held wine in such abhorrence as to use mere water in the Lord's Supper, fasted rigorously, and lived

Kirchengeschichte, vol. i. pt. ii. p. 779—807. *Tr.*]

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* l. iv. c. 30, and the writers on the ancient heresies. Origen, *Dial. contra Marcionitas*, § 3, p. 70, ed. Wetstein. Fred. Strunzius, *Historia Bardesanis et Bardesanistar.* Wittenb. 1722, 4to. Beausobre, *Hist. du Manichéisme*, vol. ii. p. 128, &c. [Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 394, &c. C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. i. p. 407—424. A. Neander,

Kirchengesch. vol. i. pt. ii. p. 743, &c. *Tr.*]

² [Tatian had professed oratory at Rome with reputation, and so long as his Christian instructor, Justin Martyr, lived, he gave no ground for suspecting the soundness of his faith. Afterwards, he was said to have borrowed some errors from the Gnostics, others from the Valentinians, others again from the Marcionists. *Cent. Magdebb.* ii. 100. *Ed.*]

in celibacy; they were denominated *Encratitæ*³, or *abstainers*, *Hydroparastatæ*⁴, or *Water-drinkers*, and *Apotactitæ*, or *Renouncers*⁵.

§ 10. The Gnostics of the Egyptian class differed from those of the Asiatic, in combining the oriental with Egyptian philosophy, and more especially in the following particulars:—

1. Although they supposed matter to be eternal, and also animated, yet they did not recognize an eternal prince of darkness and of matter, or the evil principle of the Persians.
2. They generally considered *Christ* our Saviour as consisting of *two persons*, the man *Jesus*, and the Son of God, or *Christ*; and the latter, the divine person, they supposed to have entered into *Jesus* the man, when he was baptized in Jordan by *John*; and to have left him when he was made a prisoner by the Jews.
3. They attributed to *Christ* a real and not an imaginary body, though they were not all of one sentiment on this point.
4. They prescribed to their followers a much milder system of moral discipline; nay, seemed to give precepts which favoured the corrupt propensities of men.

§ 11. Among the Egyptian Gnostics, the first place is commonly assigned to *Basilides* of Alexandria. He maintained that the supreme and all-perfect God produced from himself seven most excellent beings, or *Æons*. Two of the *Æons*, namely, *Dynamis* and *Sophia* (*Power* and *Wisdom*), procreated the angels of the highest order. Those angels built for themselves a residence, or heaven, and produced other angels of a nature a little inferior. Other generations of angels succeeded, and other heavens were built, until there were three hundred and sixty-five heavens, and as many orders of angels; that is,

³ [They abstained both from wine and animal food. *Cent. Magdebb.* ii. 102. "Tertullian speaks of Tatian as one of the heretics, who enjoined abstinence from food, on the ground that the creator of this world was a being at variance with the Supreme God, and that it was consequently sinful to partake of any enjoyments which this world affords." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 260. *Ed.*]

⁴ [Because they used water instead of wine at the Communion. *Cent. Magdebb.* ii. 102. *Ed.*]

⁵ The only work of Tatian that has reached us, is his *Oratio ad Græcos*.

His opinions are spoken of by Clemens Alex. *Strom.* l. iii. p. 460. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* xlv. c. 1, p. 391. Origen, *de Oratione*, c. 13, p. 77, ed. Oxon. and by others of the ancients: but no one of them has attempted to delineate his system. [Of the moderns, see C. W. F. Waleh, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 445—447, and A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 762—766.—It should be remembered, that the names *Encratites*, *Apotactites*, (Ἐγκρατῖται, Ἀποτακτικοί,) were applied to all the austere sects; so that, though all *Tatianists* were *Encratites*, yet all *Encratites* were not *Tatianists*. *Tr.*]

just as many as there are days in a year. Over all these heavens and angelic orders, there is a Prince or Lord, whom *Basilides* called *Abraaxas*; a word doubtless in use among the Egyptians before his time, and which, when written in Greek, contains letters that together make up the number of 365; that is, the number of the heavens⁶. The inhabitants of the lowest heaven, contiguous to eternal matter, which is an animated and malignant substance, formed a design of constructing a world out of that disorderly mass, and of fabricating men. God approved the work when it was finished, and gave rational souls to these men whom the angels had formed; whereas, before they had only sensitive souls: he also gave to the angels themselves dominion over men. The prince of these angels chose the Jewish nation for *his* subjects, and gave them a law by *Moses*. The other angels presided over other nations.

§ 12. The angels who created and governed the world gradually became corrupt; and not only laboured to obliterate the knowledge of the supreme God, in order that they might themselves be worshipped as gods, but also they waged war with each other for the enlargement of their respective territories. The most arrogant and restless of them all was he who governed the Jewish nation. Therefore, the supreme God, in compassion to the souls endowed with reason, sent down from heaven his Son, or the prince of the *Æons*, whose name is *Nus*

⁶ A great number of gems still exist, and quantities of them are daily brought to us from Egypt, on which, besides other figures of Egyptian device, the word *Abraaxas* is engraved. See Jo. Macarius, *Abraaxas seu de Genensis Basilidianis disquisitio*; enlarged by Jo. Chiffet, ed. Antwerp, 1657, 4to. Bern. de Montfaucon, *Palæograph. Græcæ*, l. ii. c. 8, p. 177, &c. and others. Learned men almost universally think those gems originated from Basilides; and hence they are called *gemmæ Basilidianæ*. But very many of them exhibit marks of the most degrading superstition, such as cannot be attributed even to a semi-Christian; and likewise manifest insignia of the Egyptian religion. They cannot *all*, therefore, be attributed to Basilides, who, though he held many errors, yet worshipped Christ. Those only must refer to him, which bear some marks of Christianity. The word *Abraaxas* was

unquestionably used by the ancient Egyptians, and appropriated to the Lord of the heavens; which Basilides retained from the philosophy and religion of his country. See Is. de Beausobre, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, vol. ii. p. 51. Jo. Bapt. Passeri, *Diss. de Gemmis Basilidianis*; in his splendid work, *de Genensis Stelliferis*, tom. ii. p. 221, &c. ed. Florent. 1750, fol. P. E. Jablonski, *de Nominis Abraaxas Significatione*; in the *Miscellan. Lipsiens. Nova*, tom. vii. Passeri contends that *none* of these gems have reference to Basilides: he makes them all refer to the magicians, or the soothsayers, sorcerers, conjurers, and fortune-tellers. But this learned man, it appears to me, goes too far; for he himself acknowledges, (p. 225,) that *he sometimes found on them some vestiges of the Basilidian errors*. These celebrated gems still need an erudite, but cautious and judicious interpreter.

[*voûs*, *mind*], and *Christ*; that he, joining himself to the man *Jesus*, might restore the lost knowledge of his Father, and overturn the empire of the angels who governed the world, and especially of the insolent Lord of the Jews. The God of the Jews perceiving this, ordered his subjects to seize the man *Jesus*, and put him to death: but against *Christ* he had no power⁷. The souls that obey the precepts of the Son of God, when their bodies die, will ascend to God: the rest will pass into other bodies. All bodies return back to vicious matter, whence they originated.

§ 13. The moral system of *Basilides*, if we believe most of the ancients, favoured concupiscence, and allowed every species of iniquity. But from much surer testimony it appears that he recommended purity of life and the practice of piety, and condemned even an inclination to sin. Still there were some things in his moral precepts which greatly offended other Christians. For he taught that it is lawful to conceal our religion, to deny *Christ* when our life is in danger, to participate in the pagan feasts which followed their sacrifices; and he detracted much from the estimation and honour in which the martyrs were held, maintaining, that, being greater sinners than other men, they were visited by divine justice for their iniquities. For it was a principle with him, that none but sinners suffer any evil in this life. And hence arose the suspicions entertained respecting his system of morals, which seemed to be confirmed by the flagitious lives of some of his disciples⁸.

§ 14. But much viler than he, and the worst of all the Gnostics, was *Carpocrates*, also of Alexandria⁹. His philosophy did not differ in its general principles from that of the other Egyptian Gnostics. For he admitted one supreme God, *Æons*, the offspring of God, eternal and malignant matter,

⁷ Many of the ancients tell us, on the authority of Irenæus, that our Saviour, according to Basilides' opinion, had not a real body; and that Simon the Cyrenian was crucified in place of him. But that Basilides supposed the man *Jesus* and *Christ*, united, to constitute the Saviour, is demonstrated in the *Comment. de Rebus Christianorum*, &c. p. 354, &c. It may be, that here and there a follower of Basilides held otherwise.

⁸ Besides the ancient writers on the heresies, Basilides is particularly treated of by Ben. Maassuet, *Dissert. in Irenæum*; and Is. de Beausobre, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, vol. ii. p. 8, &c. [C. W. F. Waleh, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 281—309; Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 342—361; and A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 679—704. *Tr.*]

⁹ [Who lived in the reign of Adrian. *Tr.*]

the creation of the world from evil matter by angels, divine souls unfortunately enclosed in bodies, and the like. But he maintained that *Jesus* was born of *Joseph* and *Mary* in the ordinary course of nature, and that he was superior to other men in nothing but fortitude and greatness of soul. He also not only gave his disciples licence to sin, but imposed on them, besides, a necessity of sinning, by teaching that the way to eternal salvation was open to those souls only which had committed all kinds of enormity and wickedness. But it is utterly beyond credibility, that any man who believes that there is a God, that *Christ* is the Saviour of mankind, and who inculcates any sort of religion, should hold such sentiments. Besides, there are grounds to believe, that *Carpocrates*, like the other Gnostics, held the Saviour to be composed of the man *Jesus*, and a certain *Æon* called *Christ*; and that he imposed some laws of conduct on his disciples. Yet undoubtedly, there was something in his opinions and precepts that rendered his piety very suspicious. For he held that concupiscence was implanted in the soul by the Deity, and is therefore perfectly innocent; that all actions are in themselves indifferent, and become good or evil only according to the opinions and laws of men; that in the purpose of God all things are common property, even the women, but that such as use their rights, are by human laws accounted thieves and adulterers. Now if he did not add some corrective to the enormity of these principles, it must be acknowledged that he wholly swept away the foundations of all virtue, and gave full licence to all iniquity¹.

§ 15. *Valentinus*, also an Egyptian, exceeded all his fellow heresiarchs, both in fame and in the multitude of his followers².

¹ See Irenæus, *contra Hæres.* l. i. c. 25. Clemens Alex. *Stromat.* l. iii. p. 511, and the others. [Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 361—371. C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzer.* vol. i. p. 309—327. A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 767—773.—Carpocrates left a young son, Epiplanes, to propagate his system: and this son, though he died at the age of 17, wrote a book, from which the world have had to learn what they could of the tenets of Carpocrates. It is doubtful whether he ought to be called a Christian. He was an Egyptian philosopher, who had perhaps borrowed

some notions from the Christians, but still his philosophy was his cynosure. Two inscriptions, in the true spirit of this philosopher, recently discovered in Cyrene in Africa, have given rise to a conjecture, that his sect continued till the sixth century. See the inscriptions, with comments, in the *Christinas. Programm* of Dr. W. Gesenius, A. D. 1825. Tr.]

² [“If we may judge from his Hellenistic expressions, and the Aramic names which appear in his system, he was of Jewish origin.” Rose’s *Neander*, ii. 71. Ed.]

His sect had its birth at Rome, grew to maturity in the island of Cyprus, and with wonderful celerity traversed Asia, Africa, and Europe. *Valentinus* held the general principles common with his brother Gnostics, and assumed the title of a *Gnostic*; yet he held several principles peculiar to himself. In the *Pleroma* (which is the Gnostic name for the habitation of God), he supposed thirty Æons, fifteen males and as many females. Besides these there were four unmarried; namely, *Horus* [*Ὅρος*], the guardian of the confines of the *Pleroma*³, *Christ*, the *Holy Spirit*, and *Jesus*. The youngest of the Æons, *Sophia* (*Wisdom*), fired with vast desire of comprehending the nature of the supreme Deity, in her agitation brought forth a daughter called *Achamoth*⁴; who being excluded from the *Pleroma*, descended to the rude and shapeless mass of matter, reduced it to some degree of order, and by the aid of *Jesus* brought forth *Demiurgus*⁵, the builder and Lord of all things. This *Demiurgus* separated the more subtile, or *animal* matter, from the grosser, or *material*; and out of the former he framed the world above us, or the visible heavens; out of the latter, the lower world, or this earth. Men he compounded of both kinds of matter; and his mother, *Achamoth*, added to them a third substance, which was celestial and spiritual. This is a brief outline of the complicated and tedious fable of *Valentinus*. It appears that he explained the origin of the world, and of the human race, in a more subtile manner than the other Gnostics; yet, that he did not differ from them in reality. And the same is true of the other parts of his system.

§ 16. The Architect of the world gradually became so inflated, that he either thought himself, or at least wished men to think him, to be the only God; and by his prophets, sent among the Jews, he arrogated to himself the honours of the supreme God. And the other angels, who presided over parts of the created universe, imitated his example. To repress this insolence of *Demiurgus*, and imbue souls with a knowledge of the true God, *Christ* descended, being composed of an animal

³ ["The genius of limitation." It is an idea deeply rooted in the Valentinian system, that, since all existence has its foundation in the self-limitation of the Bythos, so also the existence of all created beings depends on limitation. Rose's

Neander, ii. 72. *Bythos* is the supreme God, called also by *Valentinus*, αὐτὸν τέλειος, προαρχή, ἀρχή. *Ed.*]

⁴ [חַכְמַת, the sciences, or philosophy. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Δημιουργός, *Artificer*. *Tr.*]

and spiritual substance, and, moreover, clothed with an ethereal body. He passed through the body of *Mary*, just as water through a canal; and to him *Jesus*, one of the highest Æons, joined himself, when he was baptized in Jordan by *John*. The Architect of the world, who perceived that his dominion would be shaken by this divine man, caused him to be seized and crucified. But before Christ came to execution, not only *Jesus* the Son of God, but also the rational soul of Christ, forsook him; so that only his sentient soul and his ethereal body were suspended on the cross. Those who, according to the precepts of Christ, renounce the worship not only of the pagan deities, but likewise of the Jewish God, and submit to have their sentient and concupiscent soul chastised and reformed by reason, shall with both their souls, the rational and the sentient, be admitted to the mansions of the blessed, near to the *Pleroma*. And when all particles of the divine nature, or all souls, shall be separated from matter and purified, then a raging fire shall spread through this material universe, and destroy the whole fabric of nature. For the whole oriental philosophy and the system of the Gnostics, may be reduced to this epitome: This world is composed of both good and evil. Whatever of good there is in it was derived from the supreme God, the parent of light, and will return to him again; and when this takes place, this world will be destroyed^o.

§ 17. The ancients represent the school of *Valentinus* as divided into many branches. Among these were; the *Platonic* sect, whose author, *Plotinus*, differed from his master

^o Of the Valentinian system, we have a full account in Irenæus, *contra Hæres.* lib. i. c. 1—7. Tertullian, *Liber contra Valentinianos*; Clemens Alex. *passim*; and in all the ancient writers on the heresies. Among the moderns, see Jo. Fr. Buddeus, *Diss. de Hæresi Valentiniana*; subjoined to his *Introductio in Historiam Philosoph. Ebræorum*: which Diss. has occasioned much discussion respecting the origin of this heresy. Some of the moderns have attempted to give a rational explanation of the intricate and absurd system of Valentinus. See Souverain, *Platonisme dévoilé*, cap. viii. p. 64. Camp. Vitringa, *Observat. Sacre*, lib. i. c. ii. p. 131. Beausobre, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, p. 548, &c. Ja. Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*,

tome iii. p. 729, &c. Peter Faydit, *Eclairciss. sur l'Hist. Ecclés. des II. premiers siècles*, p. 12, who also contemplated writing an apology for Valentinus. I pass by Godfrey Arnold, the patron of all the heretics. But how vain all such attempts must be, is proved by this, that Valentinus himself professed that his religion differed fundamentally from that of the other Christians. [Besides the authors above referred to, see Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 371—389; C. W. F. Walch, *Hist. der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 335—386. Tr. —A full account of the Valentinian system will be found in Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 509; and in Rose's *Neander*, ii. 70. Ed.]

respecting the number and nature of the *Æons*; the *Secundian* sect, established by *Secundus*, one of the principal followers of *Valentinus*, who seems to have kept more closely to the oriental philosophy, and to have held to *two first causes* of all things, *light* and *darkness*, or a Prince of good, and a Prince of evil; the sect of *Heracleon*, from whose books *Clement* and *Origen* quote much; the sect of *Marcus* and *Calarbasus*, called *Marcosians*, who, according to *Irenæus*, added much that was senseless and absurd to the fictions of *Valentinus*; though it is certain that they did not maintain all that is attributed to them. I pass by other sects, which appear to have originated from the *Valentinian* system. But whether all the sects which are called *Valentinian* actually originated from disciples and followers of *Valentinus*, appears very doubtful to such as consider how great mistakes the ancients have made in stating the origins of the heretics⁷.

§ 18. Of the smaller and more obscure *Gnostic* sects, of which the ancients tell us little more than the names, and perhaps one or two detached sentiments, it is unnecessary to say any thing. Such were the *Adamites*, who are said to have wished to imitate the state of innocence⁸: the *Cainites*, who are represented as paying respect to the memory of *Cain*, *Corah*, *Dathan*, the inhabitants of *Sodom*, and *Judas* the traitor⁹:

⁷ Besides *Irenæus*, and the other ancient writers, see, concerning these sects, Jo. Ern. Grabe, *Spicilegium Patrum Hæreticorum*, sæcul. ii. p. 69, 82, &c. On the *Marcosians*, *Irenæus* is copious, lib. i. cap. 14. That *Marcus* was out of his senses, is unquestionable; for he must have been deranged, if he could hold even the greater part of the strange fancies which are said to belong to his system. [Among the moderns who have treated of these sects, see C. W. F. Walch, *Histoire der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 387—401, and A. Neander, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i. pt. ii. p. 731—746. Tr.]

⁸ [See, for an account of them, *Clement Alex. Stromat.* lib. i. p. 357; lib. iii. p. 525; lib. vii. p. 854. *Tertullian*, *Scorpiae*, in *Opp.* p. 633, and *contra Prax.* cap. iii. *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* lii. *Opp.* tom. i. p. 459. *Theodoret*, *Har. Fabul.* lib. i. c. 6. *Augustine*, *de Hæres.* c. 31. *John Damascen*, *Opp.* tom. i. p. 88; and, among the moderns, C. W. F. Walch, *Hist. der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 327—335. P. Bayle, *Dictionnaire His-*

torique, Art. *Adamites* and *Prodians*. *Tillemont*, *Mémoires*, &c. tom. ii. p. 256. *Beausobre*, *Diss. sur les Adamites*; subjoined to *Lenfant's Histoire des Hussites*. —The accounts of the ancients are contradictory; and several of the moderns doubt whether there ever was a sect who performed their worship in a state of nudity. Tr.]

⁹ [All the ancient writers, mentioned in the preceding note, except *John Damascen*, speak of the *Cainites*; but what they state is very brief and contradictory. The correctness of their accounts is justly doubted by *Bayle*, (*Dictionnaire Historique*, art. *Cainites*), and others. *Origen* (*contra Celsam*, lib. iii. p. 119) did not regard them as Christians. Yet they might be a sect of *Gnostics*, who, holding the God of the Jews for a revolter from the true God, regarded *Cain*, *Dathan*, *Corah*, and others who resisted him, as being very praiseworthy. Tr.—“Of the more obscure *Gnostic* sects enumerated by *Mosheim*, *Tertullian* mentions only the *Cainites*,

the *Abelites*, whom the ancients represent as marrying wives, but not procreating children¹: the *Sethites*, who regarded *Seth* as the *Messiah*²: the *Florinians*, who originated at Rome, by means of *Florinus* and *Blastus*³; and many others. Perhaps the ancient Christian doctors divided one sect into several, deceived by the fact of its having several names; they may also have had incorrect information respecting some of them.

§ 19. Among the Gnostics of the Egyptian class, a place must be assigned to the *Ophites* or *Serpentians*, a senseless sect, of which one *Euphrates* is said to have been the father. The sect originated among the Jews, before the Christian era. A part of them became professed Christians; the rest retained their former superstition. Hence there were two sects of Ophites, a Christian sect, and an anti-Christian. The Christian Ophites held nearly the same absurd notions as the other Egyptian Gnostics, concerning *Eons*, the eternity of matter, the creation of the world without the knowledge or consent of the Deity, the rulers of the seven planets who presided over the world, the tyranny of *Demiurgus*, the descent of *Christ* joined to the man *Jesus* into our world to overthrow the kingdom of *Demiurgus*, and the rest. But they held this peculiarity, that they supposed the *serpent* which deceived our first parents, was either *Christ* himself or *Sophia*, concealed under the form of a

who, according to him, were Nicolaitans under another name." Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, 522. Ed.]

¹ [The Abelites are mentioned only by Augustine, *de Hæres.* cap. 87; and by the author of the book, *Prædestinatus*, cap. 87. It is represented, that every man married a female child, and every woman a little boy, with whom they lived, and whom they made their heirs; hoping in this way to fulfil, literally, what Paul says, 1 Cor. vii. 29, that "they that have wives, be as though they had none."—The sect is treated of by C. W. F. Walch, *Hist. der Ketz.* vol. i. p. 607, who doubts whether it were not altogether an imaginary sect. Tr.]

² [The Sethites are mentioned by the author of *Prædestinatus*, cap. 19; and Philastrius, *de Hæresib.* cap. 3. But Rhenferd, (*Diss. de Sethianis*, in his *Opp. Philolog.* p. 165,) and Zorn, (*Opuscul. Sacra*, tom. i. p. 614,) consider this to be an imaginary sect. See C. W. F. Walch, *loc. cit.* p. 609, &c.; and A.

Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 758, &c. Tr.]

³ [Florinus and Blastus were, by the ancients, reckoned among the Valentinians. Both were presbyters of Rome, intimate friends, and excommunicated by the Roman bishop, Eleutherius. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 15.) As Florinus, in early life, enjoyed the instruction of Polycarp at Smyrna, and as Irenæus wrote a letter to Blastus concerning the schism at Rome about Easter day, C. W. F. Walch (*loc. cit.* p. 404,) supposes they both, and particularly Blastus, were opposed to the views of the Romish church respecting Easter. He also considers it most probable, that Florinus was inclined towards Gnosticism; for Irenæus wrote a book against him, concerning the eight *Eons*; and he actually had some followers. *Schl.*—That Florinus was a Gnostic, is clear from Eusebius. (*Hist. Eccles.* lib. v. c. 20.) That Blastus was so, is not so certain. Tr.]

serpent⁴: and this opinion is said to have induced them to keep some sacred serpents, and to pay them a species of honour. Into such absurdities men might easily fall, if they believed the Creator of the world to be a different being from the supreme God, and regarded as divine whatever was opposed to the pleasure of *Demiurgus*⁵.

§ 20. The numerous evils and discords, which arose from combining the oriental and Egyptian philosophy with the

⁴ ["According to another view, the serpent was itself a symbol, or a veiled appearance of the soul of the world; and those Ophites, who held this doctrine, are the persons who properly bear the name of Ophites, because they worshipped the serpent as a holy symbol, to which a kindred notion of the Egyptian religion might have led them; because in that the serpent is considered as the symbol of Kneph, or the ἀγαθοδαίμων, which was similar to the σοφία of the Ophites. At all events, it was the soul of the world, by which, either mediately or immediately, the eyes of the first man were opened." Rose's *Neander*, ii. 101. *Ed.*]

⁵ The history and doctrines of this sect, so far as they are known, I have stated in a German work, printed at Helmstadt, 1746, 4to. [bearing the title: *Erster Versuch einer unparteyischen und gründlichen Ketzergeschichte*. Afterwards, J. H. Schumacher published an *Explanation of the obscure and difficult Doctrinal Table of the ancient Ophites*, Wolfenbüttel, 1756, 4to. — Schumacher maintained, that the doctrine of the Ophites embraced neither metaphysics nor theology, but merely the history of the Jewish nation couched in hieroglyphics.—C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzerreien*, vol. i. p. 447—481, has epitomized both works; and we here give his leading thoughts, in further illustration of this sect.—These people, called in Gr. *Ophites*, in Latin *Serpentians*, were by the Asiatics called *Nahassians*, or *Nassians*. Irenæus, (l. ii. c. 34,) the author of the supplement to Tertullian's book, *de Præscript. Hæret.* (c. 47,) Epiphanius, (*Hæres.* xxxvii.) Theodoret, (*Hæret. Fabul.* l. i. c. 14,) and Augustine, (*de Hæres.* c. 17,) account them *Christian* heretics. But Origen (*contra Celsum*, l. vii. § 28,) holds them to be not Christians. Yet he speaks of them as pretended Christians, in his *Comment. on Matth.* tom. iii. p.

851, &c.—Philastrinus makes them more ancient than Christianity. It is most probable they were Jewish Gnostics, and that some of them embraced Christianity; so that the sect became divided into *Jewish* and *Christian Ophites*. There are two sources of information on this part of ecclesiastical history. The *first*, is the accounts of Irenæus, Epiphanius, and others. The *second*, is what Origen tells us (*contra Celsum*, lib. vi. § 33, &c.) concerning the *Diagram* of the Ophites. This Diagram was a tablet, on which the Ophites depicted their doctrines in all sorts of figures, with words annexed. It probably contained the doctrines of the Jewish Ophites, and is dark and unintelligible, unless we may suppose this symbolical representation contained that system, the principal doctrines of which are stated by the ancients. The theological system, both of the Jewish and the Christian Ophites, cannot be epitomized, and must be sought for in Walch, p. 461.—Their serpent-worship consisted in this: they kept a living serpent, which they let out upon the dish, when celebrating the Lord's Supper, to crawl around and over the bread. The priest, to whom the serpent belonged, now came near, brake the bread, and distributed to those present. When each had eaten his morsel, he kissed the serpent, which was afterwards confined. When this solemn act, which the Ophites called their perfect sacrifice, was ended, the meeting closed with a hymn of praise to the supreme God, whom the serpent in Paradise had made known to men. But all the Ophites did not observe these rites, which were peculiar to the Christian Ophites, and confined to a small number among them. This worship must have been symbolic. The Ophites had also *Talismans*. *Schl.*—See a lucid account of the Ophites, in A. Neander's *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 746—756. *Tr.*]

Christian religion, began to increase after the middle of this century, by those who brought the Grecian philosophy with them into the Christian church. As the doctrines held by the Christians respecting the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and respecting the twofold nature of the Saviour, were least of all at agreement with the precepts of this philosophy, they first endeavoured so to explain these doctrines, that they could be comprehended by reason. This was attempted at Rome, by one *Praxeas*, a very distinguished man and a confessor. Discarding all real distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, he taught that the whole Father of all things joined himself to the human nature of *Christ*. Hence his followers were called *Monarchians* and *Patripassians*. Nor was the latter an unsuitable name for them, if *Tertullian* correctly understood their sentiments. For they denominated the *man*, Christ, the *Son* of God; and held, that to this Son, the *Father* of the universe, or God, so joined himself, as to be crucified and endure pangs together with the Son. *Praxeas*, however, does not appear to have erected a distinct church⁶.

§ 21. Nearly allied to this opinion, was that which was advanced about the same time, at Rome, by *Theodotus*, a tanner, yet a man of learning and a philosopher; and by one *Artemas*, or *Artemon*, from whom originated the *Artemonites*. For, so far as can be gathered from not very distinct accounts of these men left us by the ancients, they supposed, that when the *man Christ* was born, a certain *divine energy*, or some portion of the divine nature, (and not the *person* of the Father, as *Praxeas*

⁶ See *Tertullian, Liber contra Praxeam*; and compare *Peter Wesseling, Probabilia*, cap. 26, p. 223, &c.: [*Tertullian* (to whom we are indebted for all certain knowledge of the views of *Praxeas*) was not only an obscure writer, but also a prejudiced one in regard to *Praxeas*. He not only rejected his doctrine, but hated him; because *Praxeas* had alienated the Roman bishop *Victor* from *Montanus*, whose partisan *Tertullian* was. Hence *Tertullian*, in his censures on *Praxeas*, is often extravagant and insulting. The opposition of *Praxeas* to *Montanus*, doubtless led the former into his error. *Montanus* had treated of the doctrine of three Persons in the divine essence, and had insisted on a real distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

(*Tertullian, contra Praxeam*, c. 13, p. 426.) *Praxeas*, who was hostile to *Montanus*, published his own doctrine in opposition to *Montanus*. From *Tertullian*, moreover, it appears clearly that *Praxeas* discarded the distinction of Persons in the divine essence; and, as *Tertullian* expresses it, contended for the monarchy of God. But how he explained what the Scriptures teach, concerning the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is not so clear. Of the various conceptions, we might gather from *Tertullian*, *Mosheim* gives a full investigation, in his *Comment. de Rebb. Christ.* Sec. p. 426. See also *C. W. F. Walch, Hist. der Ketzerigen*, vol. i. p. 527—546. *Schl.*—See also *A. Neander, Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. iii. p. 994, &c. *Tr.*]

imagined,) united itself to him. Which of these men preceded the other in time, and whether they both taught the same doctrine, or differed from each other, cannot at this day be decided, so few and obscure are the ancient accounts we have of them. But this is unquestionable, that the disciples of them both applied philosophy and geometry to the explication of the Christian doctrine⁷.

§ 22. The same attachment to philosophy induced *Hermogenes*, a painter, to depart from the sentiments of Christians, respecting the origin of the world and the nature of the soul, and to cause disturbance in a part of the Christian community. Regarding *matter* as the source of all evil, he could not believe that God had brought it into existence by his omnipotent volition. He therefore held, that the world, and whatever is in the world, as also souls and spirits, were formed by the Deity out of *eternal* and vicious matter. There is much in this doctrine very difficult to be explained, and not in accordance with the

⁷ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. v. c. 23. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* liv. p. 464. P. Wesseling, *Probabilia*, c. 21, p. 172, &c. [Several persons occur in the history of the heretics, bearing the name of Theodotus. (1) Theodotus of Byzantium, a tanner; of whom above. (2) Theodotus the younger, disciple of the former, and founder of the sect of Melchisedeckians. This sect derived its name from its holding, agreeably to the doctrine of the elder Theodotus, that Melchisedec was the power of God, and superior to Christ, and that he sustained the office of an intercessor for the angels in heaven, as Christ did for us men on earth. (3) Theodotus, the Valentinian. (4) Theodotus the Montanist—our Theodotus had saved his life, during a persecution at Byzantium, by a denial of Christ; and thus had incurred general contempt. To escape from disgrace, he went to Rome. But there his offence became known. To extenuate his fault, he gave out that he regarded Jesus Christ as a mere man, and that it could be no great crime to deny a mere man. He was, therefore, excluded from the church by Victor the bishop. Thus Theodotus came near to the system of the Socinians, and held Christ for a mere man, though a virtuous and upright one. Whether he held the birth of Christ to have been natural or supernatural, the

ancient accounts are not agreed. He rejected the Gospel of John; and held his own doctrine to be apostolical, and that of the eternal divinity of Christ to be a novel doctrine. See C. W. F. Walch, *loc. cit.* p. 546—557.—Artemon has, in modern times, become more famous than Theodotus; since Samuel Crell assumed the name of an Artemonite, in order to distinguish himself from the odious Socinians, whose doctrines he did not fully approve. (See his book, with the title: *L. M. Artemonii Initium Evangelii Johannis ex antiquitate restitutum*; and his other writings.) The history of this Artemon is very obscure. The time when he lived cannot be definitely ascertained; and the history of his doctrine is not without difficulties. It is not doubted that he denied the divinity of Jesus Christ, as held by orthodox Christians. But whether he swerved towards the system of the modern Socinians, or to that of Praxeus, is another question. Dr. Mosheim believed the latter; *de Rebb. Christ.* &c. 491. But, as this rests on the recent testimony of Gennadius of Marseilles, (*de Dogm. Eccles.* c. 3.) Dr. Walch (p. 564.) calls it in question. See also Jo. Erh. Rappert, *Diss. de Hist. Artemonis et Artemonitarum*, Lips. 1737. *Schl.*—See also A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. iii. p. 996—1000. *Tr.*]

common opinions of Christians. But neither *Tertullian*, who wrote against him, nor others of the ancients, inform us how he explained those Christian doctrines which are repugnant to his opinions⁸.

§ 23. In addition to the sects, which may be called the daughters of philosophy, there arose in the reign of *Marcus Antoninus* an illiterate sect, opposed to all learning and philosophy. An obscure man of weak judgment, named *Montanus*, who lived in a poor village of Phrygia called Pepuza, had the folly to suppose himself the *Comforter* promised by *Christ* to his disciples, and to pretend to utter prophecies under divine inspiration⁹. He attempted no change in the doctrines of

⁸ There is extant a tract of *Tertullian*, *Liber contra Hermogenem*, in which he assails the doctrine of *Hermogenes* concerning matter and the origin of the world. But another tract of his, *de Censu Animæ*, in which he confuted the opinion of *Hermogenes* concerning the soul, is lost. [*Tertullian* is exceedingly severe upon *Hermogenes*, who was probably his contemporary, and fellow African. Yet he allows that he was an ingenious and eloquent man, and sound in the principal doctrines of Christianity. It seems the morals of *Hermogenes* gave most offence to *Tertullian*. He had married repeatedly, and he painted for all customers what they wished. To a *Montanist* these things were exceedingly criminal. There is no evidence that *Hermogenes* founded a sect.—See *Mosheim*, *de Rebb. Christ.* &c. p. 432, &c. *C. W. F. Walch*, *Hist. der Ketz.* vol. i. p. 476, &c. and *A. Neander*, *Kirchen-gesch.* vol. i. pt. iii. p. 276, &c. Tr.]

⁹ They doubtless err, who tell us that *Montanus* claimed to be the Holy Spirit. He was not so foolish. Nor do those correctly understand his views whom I have hitherto followed, and who represent him as asserting, that there was divinely imparted to him that very Holy Spirit, or *Comforter*, who once inspired and animated the apostles. *Montanus* distinguished the *Paraclete* promised by *Christ* to the apostles, from the Holy Spirit that was poured upon them; and held, that under the name of the *Paraclete*, *Christ* indicated a divine teacher, who would supply certain parts of the religious system which were omitted by the Saviour, and explain more clearly certain other parts, which for wise reasons had been less perfectly taught.

Nor was *Montanus* alone, in making this distinction. For other Christian doctors supposed the *Paraclete*, whose coming *Christ* had promised, was a divine messenger to men, and different from the Holy Spirit given to the apostles. In the third century, *Manes* interpreted the promise of *Christ* concerning the *Paraclete*, in the same manner; and boasted that he himself was that *Paraclete*. And who does not know that *Mahomet* had the same views, and applied the words of *Christ* respecting the *Paraclete*, to himself? *Montanus*, therefore, wished to be thought that *Paraclete* of *Christ*, and not the Holy Spirit. The more carefully and attentively we read *Tertullian*, the greatest of all *Montanus*' disciples, and the best acquainted with his system, the more clearly will it appear that such were his views. [There is an obvious inconsistency here between the text and the note. In fact, *Mosheim* appears to have entertained different opinions respecting *Montanus*, at different times of life, and the note gives his last. *Bp. Kaye*, however, considers his first impressions as really correct, and confirms that judgment by citations from *Tertullian*. From these it sufficiently appears, that *Montanus* truly did identify the *Paraclete* and Holy Ghost. *Mosheim*, it will be observed, leaves his judgment unsupported. The Bishop supplies the following account of *Montanus*:—"We find in *Eusebius* the statement of an anonymous author, supposed by *Lardner* and others to be *Asterius Urbanus*, who wrote it about thirteen years after the death of *Maximilla*, one of the prophetesses who accompanied *Montanus*. From this statement, we learn that he began to prophesy at

religion ; but professed to be divinely commissioned to perfect and give efficiency to the moral discipline taught by *Christ* and his apostles : for he supposed that *Christ* and his apostles had conceded too much to the weakness of the people of their age, and thus had given only an incomplete and imperfect rule of life. He therefore would have fasts multiplied and extended, forbade second marriages as illicit, did not allow churches to grant absolution to such as had fallen into the greater sins, condemned all decoration of the body and female ornaments, required polite learning and philosophy to be banished from the church, ordered virgins to be veiled, and maintained that Christians sin most grievously, by rescuing their lives by flight, or redeeming them with money in time of persecution. I pass by others of his precepts, equally austere and rigid.

§ 24. A man who professed to be a holier moralist than *Christ* himself, and who would obtrude his severe precepts upon Christians for divine commands and oracles, could not be endured in the Christian church. Besides, his dismal predictions of the Roman state's approaching downfall, and the like, might bring the Christian community into imminent danger. He was therefore, first by the decisions of some councils, and afterwards by one of the whole church, excluded from all connexion with that body. But the severity of his discipline itself led many persons of no mean condition to put confidence in him. Pre-eminent among these were two opulent ladies, *Priscilla* and *Maximilla*, who themselves, with others, uttered prophecies, after the example of their master, who called himself the *Paraclete*¹. Hence it was easy for *Montanus* to found a new church, which was first established at *Pepuza*, a little

Arđaban, a village in that part of Mysia which was contiguous to Phrygia, while Gratus was proconsul of Asia ; that many persons were induced to believe him divinely inspired, particularly two females, Maximilla and Priscilla, or Prisca, who also pretended to possess the same prophetic gifts ; that the fallacy of their pretensions was exposed, and their doctrine condemned, and that they themselves were excommunicated by different synods held in Asia. The same anonymous author adds, that Montanus and Maximilla hanged themselves ; and that Theodotus, one of the earliest supporters of their cause, was taken up

into the air, and dashed to pieces by the Spirit of falsehood, to whom he had consigned himself, under the expectation that he should be conveyed into heaven. Our author, however, tells us that he does not vouch for the truth of either of these stories."—(*The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, illustrated from the writings of Tertullian*, 22. 12.) It is easy to account for the popularity of Montanus. He had prophecies and supernatural converse for the credulous and vain, rigid austerities for the gloomy and severe. *Ed.*

¹ [Or *Comforter*. *Tr.*]

town of Phrygia, but which spread in process of time through Asia, Africa, and a part of Europe. Of all his followers, the most learned and distinguished was *Tertullian*, a man of genius, but austere and gloomy by nature; who defended the cause of his preceptor, by many energetic and severe publications².

² See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. v. cap. 16, and especially Tertullian, in his numerous books; and then all writers, both ancient and modern, who have treated professedly of the sects of the early ages. Quite recently, and with attention and great erudition, the history of the Montanists has been illustrated by Theoph. Wernsdorf, in his *Commentatio de Montanistis seculi secundi vulgo creditis hereticis*. Dantzic, 1751, 4to.—[The Montanists were also called Phrygians, or Cataphrygians, from the country where they resided and originated; also Pepusians, from the town where Montanus had his habitation, and which he pretended was the New Jerusalem spoken of in the *Revelation* of St. John. It appears likewise, that from Priscilla they were called Priscillianists; though this name, on account of its ambiguity, has in modern times been disused. Tertullian denominated those of his faith the *Spiritual* (*Spirituales*); and its opposers the *Carnal* (*Psychikoi*); because the former admitted Montanus' inspirations of the Holy Spirit, which the latter rejected.—The time when Montanus began to disturb the church is much debated. Those who follow Eusebius, who is most to be relied upon, place this movement in the year 171, or 172. Wernsdorf's conjecture that Montanus was the bishop of Pepusa, is not

improbable. He and Priscilla and Maximilla pretended to have divine revelations, which the Paraclete imparted to them, in order to supply by them what further instruction the Christian church needed. The instruction, said they, which the Holy Spirit gives to men, is progressive. In the Old Testament, instruction was in its infancy. Christ and his apostles advanced it to its youthful stature. By Montanus and his coadjutors, it is brought to its perfect manhood. In the Old Testament God condescended much to the hardness of the people's hearts, and Christ was indulgent to the weakness of the flesh, but the Comforter is unsparing to both, and presents the virtues of Christians in their full splendour.—Their revelations related to no new doctrines of faith, but only to rules of practice. Some of them, too, were historical. But all these revelations seem to have been the effect of their melancholy temperament, and of an excessively active imagination.—See, concerning Tertullian, Hamberger's account of the principal writers, vol. ii. p. 492, and J. G. Walch, *Hist. Eccles. N. Test.* p. 618, &c.; and concerning the Montanists, C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzerzeigen*, vol. i. p. 611, &c. *Schl.*—Also A. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. iii. p. 870—893. *Tr.*]

CENTURY THIRD.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Rights and immunities of Christians enlarged.—§ 2. Under various emperors. Good-will of Alexander towards Christ.—§ 3. Other emperors favourable to the Christians. The religion of the emperor Philip.—§ 4. The number of Christians augmented: from causes, partly, divine—§ 5. and, partly, human.—§ 6. Countries added to the kingdom of Christ.—§ 7. State of the church in France, Germany.

§ 1. THAT Christians suffered very great evils in this century, and were in perfect security during no part of it, admits of no controversy. For, not to mention the popular tumults raised against them by the pagan priests, the governors and magistrates could persecute them, without violating the empire's ancient laws, as often as either superstition, or avarice, or cruelty prompted. Yet, it is no less certain that the rights and liberties of the Christians were increased more than many have supposed. In the army, in the court, and among all ranks, there were many Christians whom no one molested at all; and under most of the Roman emperors who reigned in this century, Christianity presented no obstacle to the attainment of public honours. In many places also, with the full knowledge of the emperors and magistrates, they had certain houses in which they assembled for the worship of God. Yet it is probable, nay, more than probable, that the Christians com-

monly purchased this security and these liberties with money; although some of the emperors had very kind feelings towards them, and were not greatly opposed to their religion.

§ 2. *Antoninus*, surnamed *Caracalla*, the son of *Severus*, came to the throne in the year 211; and during the six years of his reign he neither oppressed the Christians himself, nor suffered others to oppress them¹. *Antoninus Heliogabalus*², though of a most abandoned moral character, had no hostility towards the Christians³. His successor *Alexander Severus*⁴, an excellent prince, did not, indeed, repeal the laws which had been enacted against the Christians, so that instances occur of Christians suffering death in his reign; yet from the influence of his mother, *Julia Mammæa*, to whom he was greatly attached, he showed kind feelings towards them in various ways, and whenever occasion was offered; and even paid some worship and honour to our Saviour⁵. For *Julia* thought most favourably of the Christian religion; and at one time invited to court *Origen*, the celebrated Christian doctor, that she might profit by his conversation. But those who conclude that *Julia* and *Alexander* actually embraced Christianity, have not testimony to adduce which is unexceptionable. Yet it is certain that *Alexander* thought the Christian religion deserved toleration

¹ [From a passage in Tertullian, *ad Scapul.* cap. 4.) asserting that Caracalla had a Christian nurse: *tacte Christiano educatum fuisse*; and from one in Spartianus, (life of Caracalla, in *Scriptor. Histor. Ang.* vol. i. p. 707, cap. 1.) asserting that he was much attached to a Jewish play-fellow, when he was seven years old; it has been inferred that he was half a Christian, and on that account was indulgent to the followers of Christ. But it is much more probable that they purchased his indulgence with their gold. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 460. *Tr.*]

² [A. D. 218—222. *Tr.*]

³ Lampridius, *Vita Heliogabali*, cap. 3, p. 796. [Dicebat præterea (imperator), Judeorum et Samaritanorum religiones et Christianam devotionem illuc (Romam) transferendam, ut omnium cultuum secretum Heliogabali sacerdotium teneret: which Dr. Mosheim, (*de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 460.) understands to mean, that Heliogabalus wished the Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian religions to be freely tolerated at Rome,

so that the priests of his order might understand all the arcana of them, having them daily before their eyes. *Tr.*]

⁴ [A. D. 222—235. *Tr.*]

⁵ See Lampridius, *de Vita Severi*, c. 29, p. 930, and Car. Hén. Zeibich, *Diss. de Christo ab Alexandro in larario culto*; which is found in the *Miscell. Lips. Novæ*, tom. iii. p. 42, &c. [Most of the modern writers make Julia Mammæa to have been a Christian. See J. R. Wetstein's preface to Origen's *Dial. contra Marcionitas*. But the ancient writers, Eusebius, (*H. E.* vi. 21.) and Jerome, (*de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 54.) express themselves dubiously. The former calls her θεοσεβήτατην, and the latter *religiosam* (*devout*); and both state that she invited Origen to her court, then at Antioch, in order to hear him discourse on religion. But neither of them intimates that she obeyed his precepts and adopted the Christian faith. And in the life of Julia, there are clear indications of superstition, and of reverence for the pagan gods. *Schl.* from Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* §c. p. 461.]

beyond others; and regarded its author as worthy to be ranked among the extraordinary men who were divinely moved⁶.

§ 3. Under *Gordian*⁷ the Christians lived in tranquillity. His successors, the *Philips*, father and son⁸, showed themselves so friendly to the Christians, that by many they were supposed to be Christians. And there are arguments which may render it probable that these emperors did, though secretly and covertly, embrace Christianity. But as these arguments are balanced by others equally strong and imposing, the question respecting the religion of *Philip* the Arabian, and his son, which has exercised the sagacity of so many learned men, must be left undecided⁹. At least, neither party has adduced any evidence, either from testimony or from facts, which is too strong to be invalidated. Among the subsequent emperors of this century, *Gallienus*¹ and some others likewise, if they did not directly favour the Christian cause, at least did not retard it.

§ 4. This friendship of great men, and especially of emperors, was undoubtedly not last among the human causes which every where enlarged the church's boundaries. But other causes, and some of them divine, must be added. Among the *divine* causes, besides the inherent energy of heavenly truth, and the piety and constancy of the Christian teachers, especially noticeable, is that extraordinary providence of God, which, we are informed, excited many persons, by means of dreams and visions, who before were either wholly thoughtless, or alienated from Christianity, to come unexpectedly forward, and enrol their names among the followers of *Christ*². To this must be added the curing of diseases, and other miracles, which very many Christians still performed, by invoking the name of the

⁶ See *Fred. Spanheim, Diss. de Lucii Britannici regis, Julii Mammææ, et Philippiorum, conversionibus*, Opp. tom. ii. p. 400. P. E. Jablonski, *Diss. de Alexandro Severo sacris Christianis per Gnosticos initiato*, in *Miscell. Lips. Nor.* tom. iv. p. 56, &c.

⁷ [A. D. 236—244. Tr.]

⁸ [A. D. 244—249. Tr.]

⁹ See *Spanheim, de Christianismo Philippiorum*, Opp. tom. ii. p. 400. (P. de la Faye,) *Entretiens historiques sur le Christianisme de l'Empereur Philippe*, Utrecht, 1692, 12mo. Mammachiùs, *Origines et Antiq. Christiane*, tom. ii. p.

252, &c. See J. A. Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii toti orbi eversius*, p. 252, &c. [and Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 471.—The most important ancient testimonies are Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 34, and *Chronicon*, ann. 246. Jerome, *de Script. Illust.* c. 54. Tr.]

¹ [A. D. 260—268. Tr.]

² See Origen, *adv. Celsam*, lib. i. p. 35. *Homil. in Luca vii.* Opp. tom. ii. p. 216, ed. Basil. Tertullian, *de Anima*, cap. 14, p. 348, ed. Rigaltii. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. c. 5, and others. [See also Note⁹ on cent. ii. pt. i. ch. i. p. 136, &c. of this work. Tr.]

Saviour³. Yet the number of miracles was less in this age than in the preceding; which may be ascribed not only to the wisdom of God, but also to his justice, which would not suffer men to make gain by the powers divinely given them⁴.

§ 5. Among the *human* causes which aided the progress of Christianity, may doubtless be reckoned the translation of the Scriptures into various languages, the labours of *Origen* in disseminating copies of them, and various books composed by wise men. No less efficacy is to be ascribed to the beneficence of Christians towards those whose religion they abhorred. The idolaters must have had hearts of stone, not to have been softened and brought to have more friendly feelings towards the people, whose great sympathy for the poor, kindness to enemies, care of the sick, readiness to redeem captives, and numerous other kind offices, proved them to be deserving of the love and gratitude of mankind. If, what I would not pertinaciously deny, pious frauds and impositions deserve a place among the causes of the extension of Christianity, they doubtless hold the lowest place, and were employed only by a few.

§ 6. That the boundaries of the church were extended in this century, no one calls in question; but in what manner, by whom, and in what countries, is not equally manifest. *Origen* taught the religion which he professed himself to a tribe of Arabs: I suppose them to have been some of the wandering Arabs who live in tents⁵. The Goths, a fierce and warlike people, that inhabited *Moesia* and *Thrace*, and made perpetual incursions into the neighbouring provinces, received a knowledge of *Christ* from certain Christian priests whom they carried away from *Asia*. As those priests, by the sanctity of their lives, and their miracles, acquired respectability and authority among these marauders, who were entirely illiterate, such a change was produced among them, that a great part of the nation professed Christianity, and in some measure laid aside their savage manners⁶.

³ *Origen*, *adv. Celsum*, l. i. p. 5. 7. *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccl.* l. v. c. 7. *Cyprian*, *Ep. i. ad Donatum*, p. 3, and the Note of *S. Baluze* there, p. 376.

⁴ *W. Spencer*, *Notes on Origen adv. Celsum*, p. 6, 7.

⁵ *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. cap. 19. [But *Scimler*, *Hist. Eccl. Selecta*,

cap. i. p. 59, supposes they were not wandering Arabs. *Tr.*]

⁶ *Sozomen*, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ii. c. 6. *Paul Diaconus*, *Hist. Miscellan.* l. ii. c. 14. *Philostorgius*, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ii. c. 5. [Philostorgius says, that *Ulphilas*, who, in the fourth century, translated the Christian Scriptures into the Gothic

§ 7. To the few and small Christian churches in France, founded in the second century, by certain Asiatic teachers, more and larger ones were added in this century, after the times of *Decius*⁷. In the reign of this emperor, those seven devout men, *Dionysius*, *Gratian*, *Trophimus*, *Paul*, *Saturninus*, *Martial*, and *Stremonius* migrated to this country, and amidst various perils founded the churches of *Paris*, *Tours*, *Arles*⁸, and other places. And their disciples gradually spread the Christian doctrine throughout Gaul⁹. To this age, likewise, must be referred the origin of the German churches of *Cologne*, *Treves*, *Metz*¹, and others; the fathers of which were *Eucharius*, *Valerius*, *Maternus*, *Clement*, and others². The Scots also say that their country was enlightened with the light of Christianity in this century; which does not appear improbable in itself, but cannot be put beyond controversy by any certain testimony³.

language, was a descendant of the captives carried off by the Goths from Capadocia, in the reign of Gallienus; which is not improbable. By the influence of their Christian captives, the Goths were induced to invite Christian teachers among them; and numerous churches were collected. A Gothic bishop, named Theophilus, subscribed the acts of the council of Nice. (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. c. 41.) Yet there is indubitable evidence, that a large part of the nation remained pagans long after this period. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 449. *Tr.*—Much of the Gospels, with fragments from other portions of the scriptural versions made by Ulphilas, are extant, and form a most valuable monument of the ancient speech of northern Europe. The letters used are all capitals and adopted from the Greek alphabet. *Ed.*]

⁷ [A.D. 250. *Tr.*]

⁸ [*Narbonne*, *Toulouse*, *Limoges*, *Clermont*. *Tr.*]

⁹ Gregory Turonensis, *Historia Francor.* lib. i. c. 23, p. 23. Theod. Raimart, *Acta Martyrum sincera*, p. 109, &c. [See Note¹ on cent. ii. pt. i. ch. i. p. 135, 136, &c. of this work; where the origin of the Gallic or French churches is considered at some length. *Tr.*]

¹ [*Tongres*, *Liège*. *Tr.*]

² Aug. Calmet, *Histoire de Lorraine*, tome i. Diss. i. p. vii. &c. Jo. Nicol. de Hontheim, *Historia Treverensis*. [See also, Notes¹ and ² on cent. i. pt. i. ch. i. p. 134 of this work. *Tr.*]

³ See Ussher and Stillingfleet, on the *Origin and Antiquities of the British Churches*; and Geo. Mackenzie, *de Reguli Scotorum Prosapia*, cap. viii. p. 119, &c.

CHAPTER II.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The persecution of Severus.—§ 2. of Maximinus, the Thracian.—§ 3. The cruelty of Decius led many Christians to deny Christ.—§ 4. Controversies in the church on this subject, *Libelli pacis*.—§ 5. Persecutions of Gallus and Volusian, —§ 6. of Valerian.—§ 7. State of the church under Gallienus, Claudius, and Aurelian.—§ 8. Attempts of the philosophers against the Christians.—§ 9. Comparisons of some philosophers with Christ.—§ 10. Injury thence arising.—§ 11. Attempts of the Jews against the Christians.

§ 1. IN the commencement of this century, the Christians were variously afflicted in many of the Roman provinces; but their calamity was increased in the year 203, when the emperor *Severus*, who was otherwise not hostile to them, enacted a law, that no person should abandon the religion of his fathers for that of the Christians, or even for that of the Jews¹. Although this law did not condemn the [existing] Christians, but merely restrained the propagation of their religion, yet it afforded to rapacious and unjust governors and judges great opportunity for troubling the Christians, and for putting many of the poor to death, in order to induce the rich to avert their danger by money. Hence, after the passing of this law, very many Christians in Egypt, and in other parts of both Asia and Africa, were cruelly slain; and among them were *Leonidas*, the father of *Origen*; the two celebrated African ladies, *Perpetua* and *Felicitas*, whose Acts² have come down to us³: also *Potamiana*, a virgin; *Marcella*, and others of both sexes, whose names were held in high honour in the subsequent ages.

§ 2. From the death of⁴ *Severus*, till the reign of *Maximin*,

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. c. i. Spartianus, *Vita Seceri*, cap. 16, 17.

² [Martyrdom. Tr.]

³ Theod. Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum Sincera*, p. 90, &c. [See an affecting

account of the sufferings of these and other martyrs, in the reign of Severus, in Milner's *Hist. of the Church*; cent. iii. ch. v. p. 231, &c. ed. Boston, 1822. Tr.]

⁴ [Septimius. Tr.]

called *Thrax* from the country which gave him birth⁵, the condition of Christians was, every where, tolerable, and in some places prosperous. But *Maximin*, who had slain *Alexander Severus*, an emperor peculiarly friendly to the Christians, fearing lest the Christians should avenge the death of their patron, ordered their bishops, and particularly those that he knew to have been the friends and intimates of *Alexander*, to be seized and put to death⁶. During his reign, therefore, many and atrocious injuries were brought upon the Christians. For although the edict of the tyrant related only to the bishops and the ministers of religion, yet its influence reached farther, and incited the pagan priests, the populace, and the magistrates; to assail Christians of all orders⁷.

§ 3. This storm was followed by many years of peace and tranquillity⁸. But when *Decius Trajan* came to the imperial throne, A. D. 249, war, in all its horrors, again burst upon the Christians. For this emperor, excited either by fear of them, or by attachment to the ancient superstition, published terrible edicts, by which the governors were commanded, on pain of forfeiting their own lives, either to exterminate all Christians utterly, or bring them back by pains and tortures to the religion of their fathers. During the two succeeding years, a great multitude of Christians, in all the Roman provinces, were cut off by various species of punishment and suffering⁹. This persecution was more cruel and terrific than any that preceded it; and immense numbers, dismayed, not so much by the fear of death, as by that of the long continued tortures, by which the magistrates endeavoured to overcome the constancy of Christians, professed to renounce *Christ*; and procured for themselves safety, either by sacrificing, or by offering incense to idols, or by certificates purchased with money. And hence

⁵ [Or from A. D. 211, to A. D. 235. *Tr.*]

⁶ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. c. 23. Orosius, *Hist.* lib. vii. c. 19, p. 509.

⁷ Origen, tom. xxviii. in *Matth. Opp.* tom. i. p. 137. Firmilian, in *Opp. Cypriani*, Ep. 75, p. 140, &c.

⁸ [From A. D. 237 - 249. *Tr.*]

⁹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. c. 39; 41. Gregory Nyssen, *Vita Thaumaturgi*, *Opp.* tom. iii. p. 563, &c. Cyprian, *de*

Lapsis, in *Opp.* p. 182, &c. [Eusebius attributes the persecution by Decius, to his hatred of Philip, his predecessor, whom he had murdered, and was friendly to the Christians. Gregory attributes it to the emperor's zeal for idolatry. Both causes might have prompted him.--The persecuting edict is not now extant; that which was published by Medon, Toulouse, 1664, &c., is probably unauthentic. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* § c. p. 476, &c. *Tr.*]

arose the opprobrious names of *Sacrificers*, *Incensers*, and *Certificated*¹, by which the lapsed were designated².

§ 4. From the prevalence of Christian defection under *Decius*, great commotions and embarrassing contentions arose every where in the church. For the lapsed wished to be restored to Christian fellowship, without submitting to that severe *penance* which the laws of the church prescribed; and some of the bishops favoured their wishes, while others opposed them³. In Egypt and Africa, many persons to obtain more ready pardon of their offences resorted to the intercession of the *martyrs*, and obtained from them *letters of recommendation*⁴, that is, papers in which the dying martyrs declared, that *they* considered the persons worthy of their communion, and wished them to be received and treated as brethren. Some bishops and presbyters were too ready to admit offenders who produced such letters. But *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, a decided and strenuous man, though far from willing to derogate from the honour of the martyrs, was nevertheless opposed to this excessive lenity, and wished to limit the effects of these *letters of recommendation*. Hence there arose a sharp contest between him and the martyrs, confessors, presbyters, the lapsed and the people, which ended in his gaining the victory⁵.

¹ *Sacrificati*, *Thurificati*, and *Libellatici*.

² See Prudentius Maran, *Life of Cyprian*, prefixed to Cypriani Opp. § vi. p. liv. &c. [For an interesting account of the sufferings of Christians in this persecution, the English reader is referred to Milner's *Hist. of the Church*, cent. iii. ch. 8, p. 257, and ch. 11, p. 293, ed. Boston, 1822, vol. i.—This persecution was more terrible than any preceding one, because it extended over the whole empire, and because its object was to worry the Christians into apostasy by extreme and persevering torture.—The *Certificated*, or *Libellatici*, are supposed to be such as purchased *certificates* from the corrupt magistrates, in which it was declared that they were pagans, and had complied with the demands of the law, when neither of these was fact. To purchase such a certificate was not only to be partaker in a fraudulent transaction, but it was to prevaricate before the public in regard to Christianity, and was inconsistent with that open confession of Christ before men,

which he himself requires. On the purport of these letters, see Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 462—469. *Tr.*—It is said in the latter of these pages, that we have no mention of the *libellas*, or *bill of security*, before the persecuting edict of Decius. *Ed.*

³ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. c. 44. *Cyprian, Epistole*, passim.

⁴ [*Libelli pacis*.] *Letters of reconciliation and peace.* *Macl.*

⁵ Gab. Albaspinus, *Observat. Eccles.* lib. i. obs. xx. p. 94. Jo. Dalkeus, *de Pacis et Satisfactionibus humanis*, l. vii. c. 16, p. 706. The whole history of this controversy must be gathered from the *Epistles of Cyprian*. [Tertullian, *de Pudicitia*, cap. 22, and *ad Martyres*, cap. 1, makes the earliest mention of these letters; whence it is conjectured, that they first began to be used about the middle of the second century.—By *martyrs* here must be understood, persons already under sentence of death for their religion, or, at least, such as had endured some suffering, and were still in prison and uncertain what would befall them.

§ 5. The successors of *Decius*, namely *Gallus* and his son *Volusian*⁶, renewed the persecution against the Christians, which seemed to be subsiding⁷: and, as their edicts were accompanied by public calamities, particularly by a pestilential disease which spread through many provinces, the Christians had again to undergo much suffering in divers countries⁸. For the pagan priests persuaded the populace that the gods visited the people with so many calamities on account of the Christians. The next emperor, *Valerian*, stilled the commotion, A.D. 254, and restored tranquillity to the church.

§ 6. Till the fifth year of his reign, *Valerian* was very kind to the Christians; but suddenly, in the year 257, by the persuasion of *Macrianus*, a most superstitious person, who was his prime minister, he prohibited the Christians from holding meetings, and ordered the bishops and other teachers into exile. The next year he published a far more severe edict; so that no small number of Christians, in all the provinces of the Roman empire, were put to death, and often exposed to punishments worse than death. Eminent among the martyrs in this tempest were *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, *Sixtus*, bishop of Rome, *Laurentius*, a deacon at Rome, who was roasted before a slow fire, and others. But *Valerian* being taken captive, in a war against the Persians, his son *Gallienus*, in the year 260, restored peace to the church⁹.

§ 7. Under *Gallienus*, therefore, who reigned with his bro-

In that age, when martyrs were almost idolized, and the doctrines of repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, imperfectly understood; the propriety of such letters was unquestioned, and their influence very great. Yet the abuses of them were felt by the more discerning. Dr. Mosheim (*de Rebus Christ. Eccl.* p. 490—497.) has collected the following facts respecting their misuse. (1) They were given, with little or no discrimination, to all applicants. *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 14, p. 24, ep. 10, p. 20.—(2) They often did not express definitely the names of the persons recommended, but said, "Receive A.B. (cum suis) and his friends." *Ibid.* ep. 10, p. 20, 21.—(3) Sometimes a martyr, before his death, commissioned some friend to give letters, in his name, to all applicants. *Ibid.* ep. 21, p. 30, ep. 22, p. 31.—(4) Some presbyters obeyed these letters without consulting the

bishop, and thus subverted ecclesiastical order. *Ibid.* ep. 27, p. 33, ep. 10, p. 20, ep. 40, p. 52, ep. 22, p. 31, 32. It is easy to see what effects would follow, when the almost deified martyrs, of every age, and sex, and condition, felt themselves to possess authority almost divine, and were besieged by a host of persons, writhing under the rigours of the ancient discipline. *Tr.*

⁶ [A.D. 251—253. *Tr.*]

⁷ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vii. c. 1. *Cyprian*, *Ep.* lvii. lviii.

⁸ See *Cyprian*, *Liber ad Demetrianum*. [Milner's *Hist. of the Church*, cent. iii. ch. 12, p. 306. *Tr.*]

⁹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vii. cap. 10, 11. *Acta Cypriani*, in Ruinart's *Acta Martyrum Sincera*, p. 216. *Cyprian*, *Epist.* lxxvii. p. 178, *epist.* lxxxii. p. 165, ed. Baluz. [Milner's *Hist. of the Church*, cent. iii. ch. 16, p. 317. *Tr.*]

ther eight years¹, and under his successor *Claudius*, who reigned two years², the condition of the Christians was tolerable, yet not altogether tranquil and happy. Nor did *Aurelian*, who came to the throne A.D. 270, undertake to disquiet them during four years. But in the fifth year of his reign, prompted either by his own superstition, or by that of others, he prepared for war against them. But before his edicts had been published over the whole empire, he was assassinated in Thrace, A.D. 275³. Hence, few Christians were cut off under him. The remainder of this century—if we except some few instances of the injustice, the avarice, or the superstition of the governors⁴—passed away, without any great troubles or injuries done to Christians living among Romans.

§ 8. While the emperors and provincial governors were assailing Christians with the sword and with edicts, the Platonic philosophers, before described, fought them with disputations, books, and stratagems. And the more was to be feared from them, because they approved and adopted many doctrines and institutions of the Christians, and, following the example of their master, *Ammonius*, attempted to amalgamate the old religion and the new. At the head of this sect, in this century, was *Porphyry*, a Syrian, or Tyrian, who composed a long work against the Christians, which was afterwards destroyed by the imperial laws⁵. He was undoubtedly an acute, ingenious, and learned man, as his works which are extant evince; but he was not a formidable enemy to the Christians. For he had more imagination and superstition, than sound argument and judgment; as his books that remain, and the history of his life, will show; without recurrence to the fragments of his work against the Christians, which are preserved, and which are unworthy of a wise and upright man.

¹ [A.D. 260—268. *Tr.*]

² [A.D. 268—270. *Tr.*]

³ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* i. vii. c. 30. Lactantius, *de Mortibus Persecutor.* cap. 6.

⁴ One example is, the iniquity of the Cæsar, Galerius Maximian, near the end of the century, who persecuted the soldiers and servants of his palace, that professed Christianity. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. viii. cap. 1 and 4.

⁵ See Lu. Holstein, *de Vita Porphyryi*, cap. 11. J. A. Fabricius, *Luce Ecclæ.*

toti orbi exorians, p. 154. J. F. Buddénus, *Isagoge in Theologiam*, lib. ii. p. 877, &c. (and Ja. Brucker's *Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 236, &c. His fifteen *Books against the Christians* were condemned to be burned by Theodosius II. and Valentinian III. A.D. 449, (see the *Codex Justinianus de Summa Trinitate*, l. i. tit. i. cap. 3.) The work was answered by Methodius, Eusebius, Apollinaris, and Philostorgius; but the answers are lost. Of the work of Porphyry, extracts are preserved by Eusebius, Jerome, and others. *Tr.*]

§ 9. Among the wiles and stratagems, by which this sect endeavoured to subvert the authority of the Christian religion, this deserves to be particularly mentioned, that they drew comparisons between the life, miracles, and transactions of our Saviour, and the history of the ancient philosophers; and endeavoured to persuade the unlearned and women, that these philosophers were in no respect inferior to *Christ*. With such views, *Archylus* of Tarentum, *Pythagoras* and *Apollonius* Tyanæus, a Pythagorean philosopher, were brought again upon the stage, and exhibited to the public dressed very much like *Christ* himself. The life of *Pythagoras* was written by *Porphyry*⁶. The life of *Apollonius*, whose travels and prodigies were talked of by the vulgar, and who was a crafty mountebank, and the ape of *Pythagoras*, was composed by *Philostratus*, the first rhetorician of the age, in a style which is not inelegant. The reader of the work will readily perceive, that the philosopher is compared with our Saviour; and yet he will wonder, that any man of sound sense could have been deceived by the base tales and fictions of the writer⁷.

§ 10. But as nothing is so irrational, that it cannot find patrons among the weak and ignorant, who regard words more than arguments, there were not a few who were ensnared by these silly attempts of the philosophers. Some were induced by these stratagems to abandon the Christian religion which they had embraced. Others, being told that there was little difference between the ancient religion, rightly explained and restored to its purity, and the religion which *Christ* really taught, not that corrupted form of it which his disciples professed, concluded it best for them to remain among those who worshipped the gods. Some were led by those comparisons of *Christ* with the ancient heroes and philosophers, to frame for themselves a kind of mixed or compound religion. Witness,

⁶ [And in the next century by Jamblichus. That both biographers had the same object, is shown by Lad. Küster, *Adnot. ad Jamblich.* cap. 2, p. 7, and cap. 19, p. 78. *Schl.*]

⁷ See Godfr. Olearius, *Præfati. ad Philostrati vitam Apollonii*; and Mosheim, *Notes on Cadworth's Intellectual System*, p. 304. 309. 311. 434. [also J. Brucker's *Historia Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 96, &c. and Entick's *Abridgment of*

Brucker, vol. ii. p. 42, &c. N. Lardner's *Works*, vol. viii. p. 256-292. *Apollonius* was born about the beginning, and died near the close, of the first century. He travelled over all the countries from Spain to India; and drew much attention by his sagacious remarks, and by his pretensions to superhuman knowledge and powers. He was a man of genius, but vain-glorious and a great impostor. *Tr.*]

among others, *Alexander Severus*⁸, who esteemed *Christ*, *Orpheus*, *Apollonius*, (and who not?) all worthy of equal honour.

§ 11. The *Jews* were reduced so low, that they could not, as formerly, excite in the magistrates any great hatred against the Christians. Yet they were not wholly inactive, as appears from the books written by *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* against them. There occur also in the Christian fathers several complaints of the hatred and the machinations of the *Jews*⁹. During the persecution of *Severus*, one *Domitianus* abandoned Christianity for Judaism, undoubtedly to avoid the punishments that were decreed against the Christians. *Scrapion* endeavoured to recall him to his duty by a particular treatise¹. This example shows, that while the Christians were in trouble, the *Jews* were in safety: and, therefore, though greatly depressed, they had not lost all power of doing injury to the Christians.

⁸ [The emperor. *Tr.*]

¹ Eusebius, *Historia Eccles.* lib. vi.

⁹ Hippolytus, *Sermo in Susann. et* cap. 12.
Daniel, Opp. tom. i. p. 274. 276.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. Decay of learning.—§ 2. State of philosophy, especially the Platonic, Plotinus.
—§ 3. This philosophy prevails every where.—§ 4. Different sects of it.—§ 5.
State of learning among Christians.

§ 1. LITERATURE, which had suffered much in the preceding century, in this lost nearly all its glory. Among the Greeks, with the exception of *Dionysius Longinus*, an excellent rhetorician, *Dion Cassius*, a fine historian, and a few others, scarcely any writers appeared who can be much commended for genius or erudition. In the western provinces, still smaller was the number of men truly lettered and well-informed; although schools yet flourished every where devoted to intellectual cultivation. Very few of the emperors, indeed, favoured learning, civil wars keeping the state almost constantly in commotion, and the perpetual incursions of barbarous nations into the most cultivated provinces, extinguished with the public tranquillity, even the thirst for knowledge¹.

§ 2. As for the philosophers, about every sect of Grecian philosophy yet had some adherents that were not contemptible, and who are in part mentioned by *Longinus*². But the school of *Ammonius*, the origin of which has been already stated, gradually cast all others into the back ground. From Egypt

¹ See *Histoire Littéraire de la France*,
par les Moines Bénédictins, tom. i. pt. ii.
p. 317, &c.

² In Porphyry's *Life of Plotinus*, cap.
20, p. 128, ed. Fabricii.

it spread in a short time over nearly the whole Roman empire, and drew after it almost all persons who took any interest in things remote from sense. This prosperity was owing especially to *Iulianus*, the most distinguished disciple of *Ammonius*, a man of the greatest acuteness, and by his very nature formed for any abstruse investigation. For he taught, first in Persia, then at Rome, and in Campania, to vast concourses of youth; and embodied precepts in various books, a great part of which has come down to us³.

§ 3. It is almost incredible what a number of pupils in a short time issued from the school of this man. But among them, no one is more celebrated than *Porphyry*, a Syrian, who spread over Sicily and many other countries the system of his master, enlarged with new inventions and more elaborately polished⁴. At Alexandria, scarcely any other philosophy than this was publicly taught from the times of *Ammonius* down to the sixth century. It was introduced into Greece by one *Plutarch*, who was educated at Alexandria, and who re-established the Academy at Athens, which subsequently embraced many very renowned philosophers, who will hereafter be mentioned⁵.

§ 4. The character of this philosophy has already been explained as far as was compatible with the brevity of our work. It is here proper to add, that all who were addicted to it did not hold the same opinions, but differed from each other on several points. This diversity naturally arose from that principle which the whole sect kept in sight; namely, that truth was to be pursued without restraint, and to be gleaned out of all systems. Hence the Alexandrian philosophers sometimes would receive what those of Athens rejected. Yet there were certain leading doctrines, which served as foundations to the system, that no one who claimed the name of a Platonist, dared to call in question. Such were the doctrines of one God, the source of all things, of the eternity of the world, of the

³ See Porphyrii, *Vita Plotini*, republished by J. A. Fabricius, in *Biblioth. Græca*, vol. iv. p. 91. Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, tom. iii. v. *Plotinus*, p. 2330; and the learned Ja. Brucker, *Historia Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 217, &c.

⁴ Luc. Holstenius, *Vita Porphyrii*, republished by Fabricius, in *Biblioth. Græca*. —[“Porphyry was first the disciple of Longinus, author of the justly celebrated

treatise on the Sublime. But having passed from Greece to Rome, where he heard Plotinus, he was so charmed with the genius and penetration of this philosopher, that he attached himself entirely to him. See Plotin. *Vita*, p. 3. Eunap. c. 2, p. 17.” *Macl.*]

⁵ Marinus, *Vita Procli*, cap. 11, 12. p. 25, &c.

dependence of matter on God, of the plurality of Gods, of the method of explaining the popular superstitions, and some others.

§ 5. The estimation in which human learning should be held, was a question on which the Christians were about equally divided. For, while many thought that the literature and writings of the Greeks ought to receive attention, there were others who contended that true piety and religion were endangered by such studies. But the friends of philosophy and literature gradually acquired the ascendancy. To this issue *Origen* contributed very much; who, having early imbibed the principles of the New Platonism, inauspiciously applied them to theology, and earnestly recommended them to the numerous youth who attended on his instructions. And the greater the influence of this man, which quickly spread over the whole Christian world, the more readily was his method of explaining the sacred doctrines propagated. Some of the disciples of *Plotinus* also connected themselves with the Christians, yet retained the leading sentiments of their master⁶: and these undoubtedly laboured to disseminate their principles around them, and to instil them into the minds of the uninformed.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS AND OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Form of the government of the Church.—§ 2. What rank the bishop of Rome held in this century.—§ 3. Gradual progress towards a hierarchy.—§ 4. The views of the clergy.—§ 5. Hence the inferior orders of the clergy.—§ 6. Marriage of the clergy. Their concubines.—§ 7. The principal writers, Grecian and Oriental.—§ 8. Latin writers.

§ 1. THE form of ecclesiastical government which had been already adopted was more confirmed and strengthened, both as regards individual churches and the whole society of Christians. He must be ignorant of the history and of the monuments of this

⁶ Augustine, *Epistola lvi. ad Dioscor.* Opp. tom. ii. p. 260.

age, who can deny that a person bearing the title of *bishop* presided over each church in the larger cities, and managed its public concerns with some degree of authority, yet having the *presbyters* for his council, and taking the voice of the whole people on subjects of any moment¹. It is equally certain, that one bishop in each province was greater than the rest in rank and in some privileges. This was necessary for maintaining that consociation of churches which had been introduced in the preceding century, and for holding councils more conveniently and easily. Yet it must be added, that the prerogatives of these principal bishops were not every where accurately ascertained; nor did the bishop of the chief city in a province always hold the rank of first bishop. This also is beyond controversy, that the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, as presiding over the primitive and apostolic churches in the greater divisions of the empire, had precedence of all others, and were not only often consulted on weighty affairs, but likewise enjoyed certain prerogatives peculiar to themselves.

§ 2. As to the bishop of Rome in particular, he was regarded by *Cyprian*², and doubtless by others also, as holding a certain *primacy* in the church. But the fathers, who with *Cyprian* attributed this primacy to the Roman bishop, strenuously contended for the equality of all bishops in respect to dignity and authority; and disregarding the bishop of Rome's judgment, whenever they thought it incorrect, had no hesitation in following their own. Of this, *Cyprian* himself gave a striking example in his famous controversy with *Stephen*, bishop of Rome, concerning the *baptism of heretics*. Whoever shall duly con-

¹ Authorities are cited by David Blondell, *Apologia pro Sententia Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris*, p. 136, &c.—[and still more amply by James Boileau, under the fictitious name of Claudius Fonteus, in his book *de Antiquo Jure Presbyterorum in Regimine Ecclesiastico*, Turin, 1676, 12mo. The most valuable of these testimonies are from the *Epistles* of *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, who was a warm advocate for episcopal pre-eminence, yet did not presume to determine any question of moment by his own authority, or without the advice and consent of his presbyters, and was accustomed to take the sense of the whole church on subjects of peculiar interest. See *Cyprian*,

Ep. v. p. 11, ep. xiii. p. 23, ep. xxviii. p. 39, ep. xxiv. p. 33, ep. xxvii. p. 37, 38.—To the objection, that *Cyprian* did himself ordain some presbyters and lectors, without the consent of his council and the laity, it is answered, that the persons so advanced were *confessors*, who, according to usage, were entitled to ordination, without any previous election. *Cyprian*, *Ep.* xxxiv. p. 46, 47, ep. xxxv. p. 48, 49. *Tertullian*, *de Anima*, c. 55, p. 353, &c.—See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rabb. Christ.* § c. p. 575—579. *Tr.*]

² *Cyprian*, *Ep.* lxxiii. p. 131, ep. lv. p. 86, *de Unitate Ecclesiæ*, p. 195, ed. Baluze.

sider the facts together, will readily perceive that this *primacy* was not one of *power* and authority, but only of precedence and consociation. Now the primacy of the Roman bishop in regard to the whole church, was the same as that of *Cyprian* in the African church, which did not impair at all the equality of the African bishops, or curtail their liberties and rights, but merely conferred the privilege of convoking councils, of presiding in them, and admonishing his brethren fraternally, and the like³.

§ 3. Although the ancient mode of church government seemed in general to remain unaltered, yet there was a gradual deflection from its rules, and an approximation towards the form of a rule by individuals. For the bishops claimed much higher authority and power than before, and gradually encroached upon the rights not only of ordinary Christians, but also of the presbyters. And to give plausibility to this, they advanced new doctrines concerning the church and the episcopal office; which, however, were so obscure for the most part, that they scarcely seem themselves to have understood them. The principal author of these innovations was *Cyprian*, than whom no one had ever contended more boldly and vehemently for episcopal power from the very beginning of Christianity. He was not, however, uniform and consistent, for in times of difficulty, when urged by necessity, he could give up his pretensions, and submit every thing to the judgment and authority of the church⁴.

³ See Stephan. Baluze, *Annot. ad Cypriani Epist.* p. 387. 389. 400, &c. and especially Cyprian himself, who contends strenuously for the perfect equality of all bishops. *Ep.* lxxi. p. 127. Nam nec Petrus—vindicebat sibi aliquid insolenter, aut arroganter assumpsit se *primum tenere*, et obtemperari a novellis et posteris sibi oportere.—*Ep.* lxxiii. p. 137. Unusquisque Episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem.—*Ep.* lv. ad *Coradum Rom.* p. 86. Cum statutum—et æquum sit pariter ac justum, ut uniuscujusque causa illie audiat ubi est crimen admissum, et singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quum regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus.—[and Cyprian's address at the opening of the council of Carthage, A.D. 255. in his Works, p. 329, ed. Baluze. Neque enim quis-

quam nostram Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit, quando habeat *omnis Episcopus* pro licentia libertatis et potestatis sue arbitrium proprium, tanque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare. Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui *unus et solus* habet potestatem et preponendi nos in ecclesie sue gubernatione, et de acta nostro judicandi.—The passages referred to in the preceding note, in which Cyprian not very intelligibly speaks of a unity in the church and of a certain *primacy* of the Roman pontiff, must be so understood as not to contradict these very explicit assertions of the absolute equality of all bishops.—See Musheim's *de Rebus Christ.* &c. p. 579—587. *Tr.*]

⁴ [No man can speak in higher terms

§ 4. This change in the form of ecclesiastical government was followed by a corrupt state of the clergy. For although examples of primitive piety and virtue were not wanting, yet many were addicted to dissipation, arrogance, voluptuousness, contention, and other vices. This appears from numerous complaints, of the most credible persons in those times⁵. Many bishops now affected the privileges of princes, especially those who had charge of the more numerous and wealthy congregations; for they dazzled the eyes and minds of the populace, by a throne, attendants, and other ensigns of religious majesty, perhaps also with splendid robes. The *presbyters* imitated the example of their superiors, and, neglecting their duties, followed a luxurious way of life. This emboldened the *deacons* to make encroachments upon the rights and offices of *presbyters*.

§ 5. And from this cause chiefly, in my opinion, the *minor orders* of clergy were every where, in this century, added to the bishops, *presbyters*, and *deacons*. The words *subdeacons*, *acolytes*, *door-keepers*, *exorcists*, and *copiæ*⁶, designate officers,

of the power of bishops than the arrogant Cyprinus—that very Cyprinus who, when not fired by any passion, is so condescending towards *presbyters*, *deacons*, and the common people. He inculcates, on all occasions, that bishops derive their office, not so much from their election by the clergy and people, as from the attestation and decree of God. See *Ep.* lii. p. 68, 69. ep. xlv. p. 59. ep. lv. p. 82. ep. lxx. p. 113. ep. lxxix. p. 121. He regards bishops as the *successors of the apostles*. *Ep.* xlii. p. 57. So that bishops are amenable to none, but to God only; while *presbyters* are amenable to the religious society. *Ep.* xi. p. 19.—*Deacons* were created by the bishop; and, therefore, can be punished by him alone, without the voice of the society. *Ep.* lxx. p. 114.—Bishops have the same rights with apostles, whose successors they are. And hence, none but God can take cognizance of their actions. *Ep.* lxxix. p. 121.—The whole church is founded on the bishop; and no one is a true member of the church who is not submissive to his bishop. *Ep.* lxxix. p. 123.—Bishops represent Christ himself, and govern and judge in his name. *Ep.* lv. *ad Cornel.* p. 81, 82.—Hence all bishops, in the following ages, styled themselves Vicars of Christ. See J. Bingham's *Orig. Eccles.* vol. i. p. 81,

&c. In the ninth century, a bishop of Paris is so styled in a letter of Servatus Lupus. *Ep.* xcix. p. 149, ed. Baluze. After the ninth century, the bishops of Rome assumed the exclusive right to this as well as other honorary episcopal titles. See, From Moshelm, *de Rebus Christianor.* p. 518, &c.]

⁵ Origen, *Comment.* in *Matthæum*, pt. i. Opp. p. 420. 441, 442. Eusebius, *Historia Eccles.* lib. viii. cap. 1, p. 291. Cyprinus, in many of his *Epistles*.

⁶ [Subdeacons are said by Bona, to have been either instituted by Christ, as the later schoolmen think, or by the apostles. But he admits that Scripture makes no express mention of this order, and cites no earlier authority for it than an epistle attributed to Ignatius, but generally considered spurious, though the cardinal himself will not give it up. Subdeacons are to wait upon the deacons. The orders inferior to the subdiaconate, Bona tells us, are said by the schoolmen to be of apostolical institution, or at least have originated from those who immediately succeeded the apostles, but he admits that nothing of the sort is proved. *Acolytes*, or *colts*, as they were anciently called in England, had the care of the lights, and of the wine and water for the Eucharist; *readers* are mentioned by Tertullian, and

which I think the church would have never had if the rulers of it had possessed more piety or true religion. But when the honours and privileges of the bishops and presbyters were augmented, the *deacons* also became more inflated, and refused to perform those meaner offices to which they once cheerfully submitted. The offices designated by these new titles, are in great measure explained by the words themselves. The *exorcists* owed their origin to the doctrine of the New Platonists adopted by the Christians, that evil spirits have a strong desire after the human body, and that vicious men are not so much impelled to sin by their natural depravity, and the influence of bad examples, as by the suggestions of some evil spirit lodging within them⁷. The *copiatae* were employed in the burial of the dead.

§ 6. Marriage was allowed to all the clergy, from the highest rank to the lowest. Yet those were accounted more holy and excellent who lived in celibacy. For it was the general persuasion, that those who lived in wedlock were much more

were not only to read Scripture in church, but also to bless bread and first-fruits; *exorcists* are mentioned by Tertullian, but it seems not as a particular order of ministers; when made one, they were to order non-communicants out of the church, and to pour out the water for ministration; *copiatae*, otherwise called *fossarii*, or *grave-diggers*, were employed in various duties connected with funerals: the Greek form of their name seems to come from *κοπᾶσθαι*, to labour, though some have derived it from *κοπετός*, *wailing*. Bona says, that servile offices are no longer performed in the Roman church by ordained persons, but by boys and men engaged in the ordinary way. The reader who wishes for more information on these matters, cannot do better than consult Bingham, B. iii. *Ed.*]

⁷ See J. Godofredus, *ad Concilium Theodosianum*, tom. vi. p. 48. [Several of the Catholic writers, as, e. g. Baronius, Bellarmine, and Schelstrate, believed these minor orders of the clergy were instituted by the apostles. But the most learned writers of the Romish communion, and all the Protestants, maintain that they were first instituted in the third century. See Cardinal Bona, *Rerum Liturgicar.* l. i. c. 23, § 16,

17. Morin, *de Ordinatione*, p. iii. Exere. 14, c. 1, and Bingham's *Orig. Heekes.* vol. i. Not one of these orders is even named by any writer who lived before Tertullian; nor are all of them named by him. Cyprian, in the middle of the third century, mentions *hypodiaconi*, *acolythi*, and *lectores*. See his *Epp.* 14. 24. 36. 42. 49. 79, ed. Baluz. And Cornelius, bp. of Rome, contemporary with Cyprian, in an epistle which is preserved by Eusebius, *II. E.* vi. c. 43, represents his church as embracing 46 (*πρεσβυτέρους*) presbyters; 7 (*διακόνους*) deacons; 7 (*υποδιακόνους*) subdeacons; 42 (*ἀκολούθους*) acolythi; exorcists (*ἐξορκιστὰς*), and readers (*ἀναγνώστας*), with door-keepers (*ἄμυα πολυαρούς*), together 52.—The particular functions of these inferior orders are but imperfectly defined by the writers of the third century. From the *Epistles* of Cyprian above cited, it appears that subdeacons and acolythi, singly or together, were frequently the bearers of public letters to and from bishops; and that readers were employed to read the scriptural lessons in time of public worship. The writers and councils of the fourth century describe more fully the duties of all these petty offices. *Tr.*]

exposed to the assaults of evil spirits than others⁸: and it was of immense importance, that no impure or malignant spirit should assail the mind or the body of one who was to instruct and govern others. Such persons therefore wished, if possible, to have nothing to do with conjugal life. And this many of the clergy, especially in Africa, endeavoured to accomplish with the least violence to their inclinations; for they received into their house and even to their beds, some of those females who had vowed perpetual chastity, affirming, however, most religiously, that they had no disgraceful intercourse with them⁹. These concubines were by the Greeks called *συνεῖσαι*, and by the Latins *mulieres subintroductæ*. Many of the bishops, indeed, sternly opposed this most shameful practice; but it was a long time before it could be wholly abolished.

§ 7. Of the writers of this century the most distinguished for the celebrity of his name and for the extent of his writings was *Origen*, a presbyter and catechist of Alexandria, a man truly great, and the common teacher of the Christian world. Had his discernment and soundness of judgment been equal to his genius, piety, industry, erudition, and other accomplishments, he would deserve almost unbounded commendation. As he is, all should revere his virtues and his merits¹. The second was

⁸ Porphyrius, *περὶ ἀποχρῆς*, lib. iv. p. 417.

⁹ See H. Dodwell, *Diss. tertii Cypriani*; and Lud. Ant. Muratorius, *Diss. de Sponsaculis et Anapetis*, in his *Anecdota Græca*, p. 218. Steph. Baluze, *ad Cypriani Epistol.* p. 5. 12, and others.—[This shameful practice commenced before this century. Slight allusions to it are found in the *Shepherd of Hermas* and in Tertullian; but the first distinct mention of it is in Cyprian, who inveighs severely against it in some of his *Epistles*.—It is to be remembered, that none but virgin sisters in the church, and they under a vow of perpetual chastity, became *συνεῖσαι*. With these some of the single clergy attempted to live, in the manner in which certain married people then lived,—dwelling and even sleeping together, but with a mutual agreement to have no conjugal intercourse. Such connexions they considered as a marriage of souls, without the marriage of bodies. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christianor.* §c. p. 599, &c. Tr.]

¹ See P. D. Huet, *Origeniana*, a learn-

ed and valuable work; Lud. Doucin, *Histoire d'Origène et des Mouvements arrivés dans l'Eglise au sujet de sa Doctrine*. Paris 1700, 8vo.; and Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, tom. iii. art. *Origène*; and many others.—[Origen, surnamed Adamantius, (and Χαλκικύριος, from his prodigious powers and habit of sustaining labour, *Et.*) was an Alexandrian Greek, born of Christian parents A. D. 185. His father Leonidas was a man of letters, a devout Christian, and took great pains with the education of his son, especially in the Holy Scriptures, some portion of which he required him daily to commit to memory. His education, begun under his father, was completed under Clemens Alexandrinus, and the philosopher Ammonius Saccas. Origen was distinguished for precocity of genius, early piety, and indefatigable industry. When his father suffered martyrdom A. D. 202, Origen, then 17 years old, was eager to suffer with him, but was prevented by his mother. He wrote to his father in prison, exhorting him to steadfastness in the faith, and to be unsolicitous about

Julius Africanus, a very learned man, most of whose labours and

his family. The whole property of the family was confiscated, and Origen with his widowed mother and six younger sons were left in poverty. But the persecution having exterminated or driven away all the Christian schoolmasters, Origen found no difficulty in procuring a school, for which his talents so well qualified him. The next year, A.D. 203, Demetrius, bp. of Alexandria, advanced him to the mastership of the catechetical school, though he was then but 18 years old. His talents as an instructor, his eminent piety, and his assiduous attention to those who suffered in the persecution, procured him high reputation and numerous friends among the Christians; but his great success in making converts to Christianity, and forming his pupils to be intelligent and devoted Christians, rendered him odious to the pagans, who watched about his house, and hunted him through the city, in order to assassinate him. The austerity of his life was great. He fed on the coarsest fare, went barefoot, and slept on the ground. He spent the whole day in teaching, and in active duties, and devoted most of the night to his private studies and to devotion. About this time he sold his large and valuable collection of pagan authors, for a perpetual income of four *oboli* (about seven cents) per diem, which he regarded as a competent support. Constraining the passage in *Matth.* xix. 12, literally, he emasculated himself, in order to avoid temptation in his intercourse with his female pupils. About the year 212, he made a short visit to Rome. On his return he took his former pupil Heracles to be his assistant in the school, so that he might devote more time to theology and the exposition of the Scriptures. Many learned persons, pagans and heretics, were converted by him; and among them, Ambrose, a Valentinian and a man of wealth, who became a liberal patron of Origen, and at last died a martyr. In the year 215, the persecution under Caracalla obliged Origen to flee from Alexandria. He retired to Caesarea in Palestine, where he was received with high respect; and though not even a deacon at that time, the bishops of Caesarea and Jerusalem allowed him to expound the Scriptures publicly in their presence. The next year, Demetrius called him back to

Alexandria and to his mastership of the catechetical school. About this time an Arabian prince invited him to his court, to impart to him Christian instruction. Afterwards, Mammea, the mother of the emperor Alexander Severus, sent for him to Antioch, in order to hear him preach. In the year 228, he was publicly called to Achaia, to withstand the heretics who disturbed the churches there. On his return through Palestine, Theoctistus, bp. of Caesarea, and Alexander, bp. of Jerusalem, who had before treated him with marked attention, ordained him a presbyter, to the great offence of Demetrius, who was envious of the growing reputation of his catechist. Demetrius had little to object against Origen, except that he was a eunuch, and that foreign bishops had no right to ordain his laymen. Controversy ensued, and in the year 230, Demetrius assembled two councils against him, the first of which banished Origen from Alexandria, and the second deprived him of his clerical office. Demetrius also wrote letters to Rome and elsewhere, to excite odium against this unoffending man. Heracles now succeeded him in the school at Alexandria, and Origen retired, A.D. 231, to Caesarea in Palestine. Here he resumed his office of instructor, and continued to write expositions of the Bible. But in the year 235, a persecution in Palestine obliged him to flee to Caesarea in Cappadocia, where he lived concealed for two years. After his return to Palestine, he visited Athens; and about the year 244, was called to attend a council at Bosra in Arabia, against Beryllus, bp. of that place, who was heretical in respect to the personal existence of Christ previous to his incarnation. Origen converted him to the orthodox faith. Demetrius, his persecutor, died A.D. 232, and was succeeded by Heracles, a disciple of Origen, after whom Dionysius the Great filled the see of Alexandria from A.D. 248 to 265. The persecution of Origen died with his personal enemy Demetrius, and he was greatly beloved and honoured by all around him till the day of his death. His residence was now fixed at Caesarea in Palestine; but he occasionally visited other places. His time was occupied in an extensive correspondence, in preaching, and in composing books explanatory of the

works are lost². The name of *Hippolytus* ranks very high among both the writers and the martyrs; but his history is

Bible, and in defence of Christianity. Against the more learned pagans and the heretics of those times he was a champion that had no equal; he was also considered as a devout and exemplary Christian, and was, beyond question, the first biblical scholar of the age. He was master of the literature and the science of that age, which he valued only as subservient to the cause of Christ; but he was more skilful in employing them against pagans and heretics, than in the explanation and confirmation of the truths of revelation. In the latter part of his life, during the Decian persecution A.D. 250, he was imprisoned for a considerable time, and came near to martyrdom, which he showed himself willing to meet. He was, however, released; but his sufferings in prison, added to his intense literary labours, had broken down his constitution, and he died A.D. 254, at Tyre, in the 69th year of his age.—His winning eloquence, his great learning, his amiable temper, and his reputation for sincere and ardent piety, gave him immense influence, especially among the well informed and the higher classes in society. No man, since the apostles, had been more indefatigable, and no one had done more to diffuse knowledge and make the Christian community intelligent, united, and respectable, in the view of mankind. He was in general orthodox, according to the standard of that age; but, unfettered in his speculations, and unguarded in his communications, he threw out some crude opinions, which the next age gathered up and blazoned abroad, and for which he was accounted by some a heretic. The principle errors ascribed to him, are derived from his four books *περί ἀρχῶν* (*de principiis*, on the first principles of human knowledge,) and are: 1. the pre-existence of human souls, and their incarceration in material bodies, for offences committed in a former state of being. 2. The pre-existence of Christ's human soul, and its union with the divine nature anterior to the incarnation of Christ. 3. The transformation of our material bodies into ethereal ones, at the resurrection. 4. The final recovery of all men, and even devils, through the mediation of Christ.—Origen could number among his pupils many eminent

martyrs and divines, among whom Firmilianus of Cappadocia, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Dionysius the Great, bp. of Alexandria, are best known at the present day.—His life and history are best related by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. *passim*; and by Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* cap. 55, and *Ep.* 41 or 65. The united work of Pamphilus and Eusebius, in defence of Origen, in six books, is unfortunately lost, except the first book, of which we have a translation by Rufinus. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 64, gives a philippic upon Origen and his followers. Photius, *Biblioth.* cxviii. affords us some knowledge of his lost works.—Origen was a most voluminous writer. Eusebius says he collected 100 Epistles of Origen, and that when 60 years old, Origen permitted stenographers to write down his extempore discourses.—Besides these, he composed eight *Books against Celsus*, in defence of Christianity, which are still extant; four *Books περί ἀρχῶν*, extant in a Latin translation by Rufinus; ten books entitled *Stromata*, which are lost; his *Hexapla* and *Tetrapla*, of which little remains; and tracts on prayer, martyrdom, and the resurrection. But his principal works are expositions of the Scriptures. It is said, he wrote on every book in the Bible, except the Apocalypse. His allegorical mode of interpreting Scripture is described by Mosheim in the next chapter. Origen's expositions are of three kinds:—1. Homilies, or popular lectures. 2. Commentaries, divided into books, which are full, elaborate, and learned expositions. 3. *Scholæ*, or short notes, intended especially for the learned. A collection of Origen's *Scholæ*, and scattered remarks on Scripture, compiled by Basil the Great and Gregory Nazianzen, is extant, bearing the title of *ᾠδοκαλία*. A large part of his Homilies and Commentaries is wholly lost, and some of the others have come to us only in the Latin translation of Rufinus.—The earlier editions of Origen's works are chiefly in Latin, and of little value. P. D. Huet, a Benedictine monk, first published, A.D. 1668, in 2 vols. fol. the expository works of Origen, Greek and Latin, with notes, and a valuable introduction entitled *Origeniana*. Bern. de Montfaucon, another Benedictine, collected and published what remains of his *Hexapla* and *Te-*

involved in much obscurity. The writings now extant bearing the name of this great man are, not without reason, regarded

tragedy, Paris, 1714, 2 vols. fol. But the best edition of all his works, except the *Hexapla*, is that of the Benedictines Charles, and Charles Vincent de la Rue, Paris, 1733-59, 4 vols. fol. The text of this edition, Greek and Latin, without the notes and dissertations, was republished by Oberthür, Würzburg, 1780-93, 15 vols. 8vo. The principal modern writers concerning Origen, besides Huet and the De la Ruës, are Tillémont, *Mém. à l'Hist. de l'Eglise*, tom. iii. p. 216-264. Bayle, *Diet.* art. *Origène*. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* vol. i. p. 112, &c. Lardner, *Credibility*, pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 161, &c. Hales, *Defence of Origen*. Douin, *Histoire d'Origène*, Paris, 1700, 8vo. Mosheim, *de Rebus Christ.* p. 605-680. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. iv. p. 29-145. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. p. 1172-1214. Milner's account of Origen, *Ecc. Hist.* cent. iii. ch. 5, 6, 15, is not impartial. *Tr.*]

² [Julius Africanus, for erudition, and as an interpreter of Scripture, is ranked with Clemens Alex. and Origen by Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 35. The best account of this distinguished man is derived from Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. c. 31, and Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 63. He was probably of Nicopolis, once called Emmaüs, in Judæa, and is supposed to have died, being a man in years, about A.D. 232. Of his life little is known, except that he once visited Alexandria, to confer with Heracles, head of the catechetical school after Origen; and that, the city of Nicopolis having been burnt, about A.D. 221, Africanus was sent as envoy to the emperor, with a petition that it might be rebuilt. His principal work was *Annals of the World, from the Creation down to A.D. 221*, in five books. This work, of which only fragments now remain, was highly esteemed by the ancients, and was the basis of many similar works, namely,—The *Chronicons* of Eusebius, Syncellus, Malala, Theophanes, Cedrenus, and others. He was author of *A letter to Aristides*, reconciling the two genealogies of our Saviour. Of this work we have a long extract in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* i. 7, and a fragment in Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacre*, vol. ii. p. 115. Africanus supposed Matthew to give the true descent of Joseph from David by Solomon, and Luke to give his legal descent from the

same by Nathan, according to the law for raising up seed to a deceased brother. Jacob and Heli, the two reputed fathers of Joseph, he supposed, were half-brothers, having the same mother, but different fathers; and Heli dying childless, Jacob married his widow, and begat Joseph, whom the law accounted as the son of the deceased Heli. Another letter of Africanus, addressed to Origen, is still extant in the works of Origen, vol. i. p. 10-12, ed. de la Rue. The object of this letter is, to prove the history of Susanna spurious, and the work of some person much younger than Daniel. His chief argument is, that the writer makes Daniel play upon the Greek words *σῴζω* and *πείρω*, in verses 54, 55, 58, 59, while examining the witnesses against Susanna. Eusebius and others ascribe to Africanus another and larger work, entitled *Κεστοί*. It is a miscellany, and unworthy of a Christian divine. Valesius thinks Eusebius mistook, attributing the work of some pagan bearing the same name, to this Christian father. Others suppose it might have been written by Africanus, in his youth or before his conversion. Many fragments of it have been collected by Thevenot, and published in his *Collection of the Writings of the ancient Greek Mathematicians*, Paris, 1693, fol. *Tr.*]

³ The Benedictine monks have, with great labour and erudition, endeavoured to dispel this darkness. See *Histoire Littér. de la France*, tom. i. p. 361, &c. Paris, 1733, 4to. [Both Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. c. 20, 22, and Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 61, make him to have flourished in the reign of Severus, A.D. 222, &c. and to have been a bishop, but of what city they could not learn. Subsequent writers have been divided, some representing him as an Arabian bishop, and others as bishop of Ostia near Rome, whence he is surnamed Portuensis. Perhaps he spent part of his life in the East, and part in the West. That he was a martyr, is generally conceded; though the Poem of Prudentius, on the martyrdom of Hippolytus, refers to another person, who was a Roman presbyter. Eusebius, l. c. gives this account of his writings: "Besides many other works, he wrote a treatise concerning Easter, in which he describes the succession of events, and proposes a Paschal Cycle of

by many as either entirely spurious, or at least corrupted. Gregory, bishop of New Caesarea¹, was surnamed *Thaumaturgus*, on account of the numerous and distinguished miracles which he is said to have wrought. But few of his writings are now extant; his miracles are questioned by many at the present day². I could wish that many writings of *Dionysius*, bishop of

16 years; the work terminates with the first year of the emperor Alexander." (Severus, A.D. 222.) "His other writings which have reached me are these: on the *Hexaëmeron*" (Gen. i.); "on what follows the *Hexaëmeron*; against Marcion; on the Canticles; on parts of Ezekiel; concerning Easter; against all the heresies." Besides these, Jerome mentions his Commentaries on Exodus, Zechariah, the Psalms, Isaiah, Daniel, the Apocalypse, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes; and tracts concerning Saul and the witch, Anti-christ, the resurrection; his discourse in praise of our Lord and Saviour. Some other works of Hippolytus are enumerated in an inscription on the base of his statue, dug up near Rome in the year 1551; also by Photius, *Biblioth.* No. 121 and 122; and Ebed-jesus, in Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* tom. iii. pt. i. His Paschal Cycle is his only work that has come down to us entire. The dialogue concerning Christ and Anti-christ, still extant, if really his, does him little credit as a theologian: the concluding part of his work against all the heresies still remains, and gives us the best account we have, though a lame one, of the heresy of Noetus.—All that remains of him, genuine and adulterated, and all that is ascribed to him, are well edited by Fabricius, in two thin volumes, fol. Hamb. 1716–18, —For a more full account of him and his writings, besides the *Histoire Litt. de la France*, and Fabricius, *ad Hippol. Opera*, see Tillemont, *Mémoires à l'Hist. Ecclés.* tom. iii. p. 104 and 309, &c. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* vol. i. p. 102, &c. Lardner, *Credib.* pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 69, &c. Schroëckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. iv. p. 154, &c. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. p. 1147, &c. *Tr.*

¹ [In Pontus. *Tr.*]

² See Anton. van Dale, Preface to his book *de Oraculis*, p. 6. [Schroëckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. ii. p. 351, &c. and p. 360–392, and Lardner, *Credibility*, pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 450, &c. Gregory of New Caesarea in Pontus, whose original name was Theodorus, was born of heathen

parents at New Caesarea near the beginning of this century. His family was wealthy and respectable. After the death of his father, which was when he was fourteen years old, his mother and the children became nominally Christians. But Gregory was a stranger to the Bible, and ambitious to make a figure in the world. About the year 231, he left Pontus, intending to study law in the famous law school at Berytus, but meeting with Origen at Caesarea, he was induced to change his purpose. He applied himself to the study of the Bible, was baptized, assumed the name of Gregory, and continued under the instruction of Origen eight years, except that he fled to Alexandria for a short time to avoid persecution. He was now a devoted Christian, and a man of great promise. On leaving Origen, he composed and read in a public assembly an eulogy on his instructor, in which he gives account of his own past life, and of the manner in which Origen had allured him to the study of the Scriptures, and changed all his views. Taking an affectionate leave of his master, he returned to Pontus, and became bishop of his native city, New Caesarea, where he spent the remainder of his life. He was a laborious and successful pastor, and highly respected for his talents and piety, as well as for numerous miracles which he is said to have wrought. When created bishop, he found but seventeen Christians in his very populous diocese. When he died, there was only about the same number of pagans in it. He and his flock endured persecution in the year 250. He attended the first council of Antioch, against Paul of Samosata, in the year 264 or 265, and died soon after.—Some account of him is given by Eusebius, *Hist. Ecclés.* vi. 30, and vii. 14, 26. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 65, and *Ep. ad Magnum*. But his great eulogists, among the ancients, were the two brothers, Basil the Great, and Gregory Nyssen, whose grandmother sat under the ministry of Greg. Thaum. and furnished her grandchildren with an ac-

Alexandria, were now extant; for the few fragments which have reached us, show that he was a man of distinguished wisdom and mildness of disposition, and prove that the ancients used no flattery when they styled him *Dionysius the Great*°. *Metho-*

count of him. Basil speaks of him in his *Book on the Holy Spirit*, and in his *Epistles*, No. 26, 110, 204, 207, or 62, 63, 64, 75; and Nyssen, in his *Life of Gregory Thaum.* inter Opp. Gregorii Nys. tom. iii. p. 536, &c. Among the moderns who give us his history, and enumerate his works, see Tillemont, *Mémoires à l'Hist. Eccl.* tom. iv. p. 131, &c. and *Notes sur S. Grég. Thaum.* p. 47. Du Pin, *Nov. Biblioth. des Aut. Ecclés.* tom. i. p. 184, &c. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. v. p. 247, &c. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* vol. i. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. p. 12—24, &c. Schroeckh, *ubi supra*. Lard, *ubi supra*, and Milner, *Eccles. Hist.* cent. iii. ch. 18.—The only genuine works of Gregory that are extant, are his Eulogy on Origen, which has been mentioned; a Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes; a short Confession of Faith (the last part of which some have questioned); and a Letter, containing counsel for the treatment of the lapsed. The spurious works attributed to him are, *Capita xii. de Fide*, with anathemas;—in *Annuntiationem Sanctissimæ Mariæ Sermones tres*; in *Sancta Theophania*, sive de apparitione Dei, et Christi Baptismo, Sermo; *de Anima disputatio ad Tatianum*; *Expositio Fidei ἡ κατὰ μέγας πύργος* (relating only to the Trinity).—All these were collected and published, with learned notes, by Gerard Vossius, Mayence, 1604, 4to, and Paris, 1622, fol. with the works of Macarius, Basil of Seleucia, and a tract of Zonaras subjoined. *Tr.*

° The history of Dionysius is carefully written by Ja. Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tome i. livr. ii. cap. 5, p. 68.—[He was probably born of heathen parents, but early converted to the Christian faith by Origen, under whom he had his education at Alexandria. He became a presbyter there; and succeeded Heraclas as head of the catechetical school, about the year 232; and on the death of Heraclas, A.D. 248, he again succeeded him in the episcopal chair, which he filled till his death in the year 265. We know little of his history while a catechist, except that he now read carefully all the works of heretics and pagans, and made himself master of the controversies of the day. (Eu-

seb. *H. E.* lib. vii. c. 7.) As a bishop, he was uncommonly laborious and faithful. He lived in stormy times, was called to almost continual contests with errorists, and had little rest from persecution, in which he and his flock suffered exceedingly. These sufferings are described in the copious extracts from his writings, preserved by Eusebius, in his *Eccles. History*, book vi. and vii. In the year 249, the pagans of Alexandria made insurrection against the Christians, murdered several, assaulted and plundered, and drove into hiding places most of the rest. The next year the general persecution under Decius commenced, and Dionysius was under arrest, and suffered much, with his flock, for a year and a half. Soon after his release, the pestilence began to lay waste the church and the city, and did not entirely cease till the end of twelve years. About the same time, Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, embraced and disseminated millenarian principles; but was at length reclaimed by Dionysius. The warm contest respecting the relapsism of converted heretics, about the year 256, was submitted, by both parties, to him, and drew forth several able productions from his pen. Not long after, he had to withstand the Sabellians in a long and arduous controversy. In the year 257, the persecution under Valerian commenced; and, for about two years, Dionysius was in banishment, transported from place to place, and subjected to great sufferings. After his return, in the year 260, insurrection among the pagans, and civil war and famine raged at Alexandria. Scarcely was quiet restored, when this aged and faithful servant of God was solicited to aid in the controversy against Paul of Samosata. His infirmities prevented his attending the council of Antioch in 263, where Paul was condemned; but he wrote his judgment of the controversy, sent it to the council, and died soon after in the close of that year. In his controversy with the Sabellians, he was, to say the least, unfortunate. For in his zeal to maintain a *personal distinction* between the Father and the Son, he let drop expressions which seemed to imply, that the latter was of another and an

dios was a man of piety, and had some weight of character; but the few works of his remaining, prove him to have been deficient in accuracy of discrimination⁷.

inferior nature to the former. This led the Sabellians to accuse him of heresy; and a council assembled at Rome, called on him to explain his views. He replied in several books or letters, addressed to Dionysius, bishop of Rome, which pretty well satisfied his contemporaries. Afterwards, when the Arians claimed him, Athanasius came forth in vindication of his orthodoxy. Dr. Mosheim (*de Rebus Christianor.* p. 696, &c.) supposed that Dionysius differed from the orthodox on the one hand, and from Sabellians on the other, in the following manner: They all agreed, that in Jesus Christ *two natures*, the human and the divine, were united. The orthodox maintained, that *both natures* constituted but *one person*, and denied personality to the human nature. Sabellius admitted the union of two natures in Christ, but denied personality to his *divine* nature. Dionysius distinguished *two persons*, as well as two natures, in Christ; and affirmed that the actions and sufferings of the human nature could not be predicated of the divine nature. Natalis Alexander has a Dissertation (*Hist. Eccles. secul. iii. diss. xix.*) in vindication of the orthodoxy, though not of all the phraseology of Dionysius. For a knowledge of the life and writings of Dionysius, the chief original sources are, Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* i. vi. c. 29, 35, 40—42, 44—46; i. vii. c. 1, 4—11, 20—28. *Prepar. Evang.* i. xiv. c. 23—27. Jerome, *de Viris Illust.* c. 69, and *Prefatio ad Lib. 18. Comment. in Esaiam*. Athanasius, *de Sententia Dionysii*; and *de Synodi Nicenae Decretis*; Basil, *de Spiritu Sancto*, c. 29; *Epist. ad Amphilocho*, and *Epist. ad Maximianum*. Of his works, only two short compositions have come to us entire; namely, his very sensible letter to Novatian, (*apud Eusebii Hist. Eccles.* vi. 45.) and his *Epistola Canonica ad Basilidem*, in which he gives his opinion respecting the proper hour for terminating the fast before Easter, and the obligation of Christians to observe certain Jewish laws respecting personal uncleanness. But we have valuable extracts from many of his letters and books. Eusebius gives portions of the following; namely, his Epistle to Germanus, giving account of his flight and sufferings in the Decian persecu-

tion (*H. E.* vi. 40, and vii. 11).—Ep. to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, describing the sufferings of his flock in the same persecution (*H. E.* vi. 40—42, 44).—Ep. to Hermannion, on the character of the emperors Decius and Valerian (*H. E.* vii. 1, 10, 23).—Ep. to Stephen, bishop of Rome, on the peace after the persecution of Gallus (*H. E.* vii. 4, 5).—Ep. to Donitius and Didymus, describing the Decian persecution at Alexandria (*H. E.* vii. 11).—Ep. to Hierax, describing the sedition at Alexandria (*H. E.* vii. 21).—Ep. to Sixtus, bishop of Rome, on rebaptism of heretics, and on the Sabellians (*H. E.* vii. 5, 6).—Another Ep. to the same, on rebaptism, &c. (*H. E.* vii. 9).—Ep. to Philemon, a Roman presbyter, on the same subject (*H. E.* vii. 7).—Ep. to Dionysius, then a presbyter at Rome, on the same subject, and concerning Novatian (*H. E.* vii. 7, 8).—Two books against Nepos and the Millenarians, on the promises to the saints in the Apocalypse, the nature of that book, and its author (*H. E.* vii. 24, 25).—Ep. to his own flock, after the plague, consolatory (*H. E.* vii. 22).—*Libri iv. de Natura*, against Epicurean doctrines, dedicated to his son. (Euseb. *Prep. Evang.* xiv. 23—27.) Athanasius also gives extracts from various of his works. Eusebius mentions several works of Dionysius, from which he gives no extracts (*H. E.* vi. 46, and vii. 26); namely, epistles to the brethren in Egypt, *de Penitentia*—to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, *de Penitentia*—to his own church, a monitory epistle—to Origen, on martyrdom—to the brethren of Laodicea—to the brethren in Armenia—to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, concerning Novatian—to the brethren at Rome, three epistles concerning the office of a deacon, concerning peace, and *de Penitentia*—to the confessors at Rome, who favoured Novatian—to the same, after they returned to the church, two letters—to Sixtus and the church at Rome, on rebaptism, &c.—to Dionysius of Rome, concerning Lucian—and various Paschal Epistles (a species of pastoral letters) addressed to Flavius—to Donitius and Didymus—to his own presbyters—to his flock, after the persecution of Valerian—to the brethren in Egypt, &c.

⁷ [Méthodius Patavensis Eubulius

§ 8. Of the Latin writers of this century, *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, deservedly stands first. The epistles and tracts of this distinguished and eloquent man, breathe such a spirit of ardent piety, that scarcely any one can read them without feeling his soul stirred within him. Yet *Cyprian* would doubtless have been a better writer, if he had been less studious of rhetorical ornaments, and a better bishop, if he had been more capable of controlling his temper and of discriminating between truth and error^s. The *Dialogue of Minucius Felix*, which he

was bp. of Olympus or of Patara, in Lycia, and afterwards of Tyre. He lived during the last half of the third century, and died a martyr, at Chalcis in Greece, probably A.D. 311, during the Diocletian persecution. Jerome (*de Viris Illustr. c. 63*) ranks him among the popular writers, and commends him especially for the neatness of his style; but Socrates (in his *Hist. Eccles. l. vi. c. 13*) represents him as one of those low and contemptible scribblers, who endeavour to bring themselves into notice by assailing the characters of their superiors. His works, as enumerated by Jerome, are (1) Two books *against Porphyry* (a large work now lost).—(2) *Fæst of the ten Virgins* (a dialogue of pious females in praise of celibacy: it is still extant, though perhaps corrupted, but does its author little credit).—(3) *On the resurrection of the body*, against Origen, *opus egyptium*. (It is but an indifferent work; much of it is preserved by Epiphanius, *Hæres. lxiv*. Photius, *Biblioth. cccxxiv*. &c.)—(4) *On the witch of Endor*, against Origen; (not extant;) *On free will* (and the origin of evil; not from matter, but from abuse of human liberty. Extracts from it remain).—(6) *Commentaries on Genesis and Canticles* (almost wholly lost).—(7) Many other popular works (not described by Jerome).—The works of Methodius, so far as they remain, were edited with those of Amphilochius and Andreas Cretensis, by Francis Combefis, Paris, 1644, fol. But the *Fæst of the Virgins* first appeared in the original Greek, in Combefis, *Auctar. noviss. Biblioth. PP. Græc. p. i.*—Several discourses of the younger Methodius, patriarch of Constantinople in the 9th century, have been ascribed to the senior Methodius. *Tr.*]

^s [Thascius Cæcilius Cyprianus was born of heathen parents, and probably about the year 200, at Carthage, in

Africa. He was rather dissipated, but was a man of genius, and a teacher of rhetoric. In the year 244 or 245 he was converted to Christianity, by Cæcilius, a presbyter of Carthage, whose name he assumed. An account of his conversion we have in his tract, *de Gradia Dei, ad Donatum*. As soon as he became a Christian, he distributed all his property in charity to the poor, devoted himself much to the study of the Bible, and of his favourite author, Tertullian, and showed a zeal and earnestness in religion seldom equalled. He was made a presbyter a few months after his conversion, and was advanced to the episcopal chair in the year 248. As a bishop he was indefatigable and efficient. Few men ever accomplished so much in a long life, as Cyprian did in the ten years of his episcopacy. In the year 250 the Decian persecution obliged him to leave Carthage and live in concealment for more than a year. During his exile he wrote 39 epistles, which are extant, addressed to his church, to its officers collectively or individually, to other bishops, and to various individuals. On his return to Carthage, A.D. 251, he had much to do to collect and regulate his flock: a controversy arose respecting the reception of the lapsed to Christian fellowship: and Cyprian had personal contests with some of his presbyters, who were opposed to him. He was also drawn into the Novatian controversy. The persecution was soon after renewed by the emperor Gallus; and pestilence and famine spread wide; and incursions of barbarians from the desert laid waste the back country. Cyprian wrote and preached incessantly; and in the year 253, called a council and roused up the African churches to great efforts for redeeming Christian captives. For several years he was most laboriously

entitled *Octavius*, answers the arguments by which the Christians were commonly attacked by their adversaries, in a manner so skilful and spirited, that it cannot be disregarded by any who would not be ignorant of the state of the church in this century⁹. The seven books of *Arnobius*, the African, against

employed in preaching, composing tracts, and directing the ecclesiastical affairs, not only of Carthage and Africa, but also of other countries. In the year 257, the persecution under Valerian broke out, and Cyprian was banished to Curubis. The persecution was severe in Africa: many were imprisoned, condemned to the mines, or put to death. Cyprian gave what aid he could to his suffering brethren. The next year, A.D. 258, he was recalled from banishment, summoned before the new governor, Maximus, and condemned to be beheaded.—Cyprian lived but 12 years after he embraced Christianity; and during 10 of these he was incessantly engaged in active duties. It was impossible, therefore, that he should become a very learned theologian. Though a man of genius, he was not a metaphysician or philosopher, and seems not to have been formed for abstruse speculations. He was an orator and a man of business, rather than a profound scholar. The practical part of Christianity, and the order and discipline of the church, most engaged his attention. Naturally ardent, and poring daily over the writings of Tertullian, he imbibed very much the spirit and the principles of that gloomy Montanist; and having high ideas of episcopal power, and great intrepidity of character, he was an energetic prelate, and a severe disciplinarian.—The best original sources for the history of this distinguished man, are his own numerous letters and tracts, and the *Passio S. Cypriani*, or account of his martyrdom, written by Pontius one of his deacons. He is very honourably mentioned by many of the fathers; and Gregory Naz. wrote a professed eulogy of him. The moderns also, especially the Roman Catholics and the English Episcopalians, have written elaborately concerning his history, his works, and his opinions. See bp. Pearson's *Annales Cyprianici*, and H. Dodwell's *Dissertationes Cyprianicæ*, in the Oxford edition of Cyprian's works, 1682; Tillemont, *Mémoires à l'Histoire Ecclési.* tom. iv. p. 19, &c., and *Notes sur S. Cyprien*, p. 10, &c. Prud. Maran,

Vita S. Cypriani, prefixed to Opp. Cyp. ed. Paris, 1726, p. 38—134; and J. Milner's *Church Hist.* cent. iii. ch. 7—15.—His works consist of 81 Epistles, and 41 Treatises, which are accounted genuine. They are nearly all practical,—hortatory, controversial, and official or friendly letters.—His style is neither perspicuous nor chaste, but ardent and animated. He and Lactantius, it has been said, were the fathers of ecclesiastical Latinity.—The earlier editions of his works, by Erasmus and others, arranged his letters in books, without regard to their dates or subjects. The edition of Pamelius, 1566, republished by Rigaltius, 1664, attempted to arrange them in chronological order. The Oxford edition by bp. Fell, 1682, fol. perfected this arrangement. The edition prepared by Baluze, and published by Prudentius Maran, Paris, 1726, fol. retains the order of Pamelius. The two last are the best editions. *Tr.*

⁹ [Minucius Felix was a respectable Christian barrister at Rome, and is supposed to have been contemporary with Tertullian, and to have flourished about the year 220. He is mentioned by Jerome, *de Viris Illust.* c. 58, and by Lactantius, *Institut. Divinæ*, l. i. c. 11, and l. v. c. 1. Little is known of his history. His elegant Dialogue between Cæcilius a pagan and Octavius a Christian, recounts the principal arguments urged for and against Christianity at that time, in a clear, concise, and forcible manner. The Latinity is pure and elegant. Jerome informs us that another tract, *de Fato vel contra Mathematicos*, was ascribed to him; but from its style, it was probably not his. This tract is now lost. In the middle ages, the *Octavius* of Minucius was mistaken for the 8th Book (*Liber Octavus*) of Arnobius: and it was so published in the earlier editions. It has been often republished. The best editions, cum notis variorum, are those of Gronovius, Leyden, 1709, 8vo; and of Davis, Cambridge, 1707 and 1711, 8vo. The Germans are fond of the edition of Cellarius, 1693, 8vo, republished by Linder, 1760,

the Gentiles, are more full and copious, and though obscure in several places, will not be read without both pleasure and profit. Yet this rhetorician, who was superficial in his knowledge of Christian doctrines, has commingled great errors with important truths, and has set forth a strange philosophical kind of religion, very different from that ordinarily received¹. The writers of less eminence, I leave to be learned from those who have professedly enumerated the learned men among Christians².

and by Ernesti, 1773, 8vo.—It has been translated into French, Dutch, and English; the last, by Reeves, among his *Apologies in defence of the Christian Religion*, vol. ii. Lond. 1709, 8vo. Tr.]

¹ [Arnobius, senior, was a teacher of rhetoric at Sicea, in Africa, during the reign of Diocletian. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 79. He was at first an open adversary of the Christian religion, but at length being fully convinced of its truth, he undertook to defend it in a learned and elaborate work. But, either his knowledge of Christianity was then very limited, or he had studied the Scriptures only in private, and without seeking instruction from the Christian teachers, for he entertained many singular opinions. Jerome reports, (*Chron. ad ann. xx. Constantini*), that when Arnobius applied to the bishop for baptism, the latter refused him, from doubts of the sincerity of his conversion; and that Arnobius wrote his book to satisfy the mind of the bishop. This account is called in question by some. See Lardner, *Credibility*, &c. pt. ii. vol. iv. p. 7, and Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. p. 1161, &c. He probably wrote in the beginning of the 4th century, and died perhaps about A.D. 326.—The best early editions of his work, are those printed at Leyden, 1651 and 1657, 4to. The latest edition is that of Orell, Lips. 1816, 8vo, in 2 parts, with an Appendix, 1817, 8vo. Tr.]

² [The following notices of other leading men in this century, may be interesting to the literary reader.

Caius, a learned ecclesiastic of Rome, in the beginning of this century, is mentioned by Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 59, and is quoted repeatedly by Eusebius. In his work against Proculus the Montanist, he assailed the Chiliasts, and ascribed but 13 epistles to St. Paul. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 25, iii. 28, and vi. 20.

He has been supposed by some, to be the author of the book against Artemon, quoted by Euseb. *H. E.* v. 28.

Just before A.D. 200, Theophilus, bp. of Antioch, Bacechylus, bp. of Ciesarea, in Palestine, and Polyocrates, bp. of Ephesus, called councils on the controversy respecting Easter-day, and composed synodic Epistles. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 43—45, and Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23 and 25. From the epistle of Polyocrates, valuable extracts are made by Jerome, l. c. and Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 31, and v. 24.

At the commencement of this century, lived Heraclitus, Maximus, Candidus, Appion, Sextus, and Arabianus, who were distinguished as writers, according to Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 46—51, and Euseb. *H. E.* v. 27. — Heraclitus commented on Paul's Epistles; Maximus wrote concerning the origin of evil (*περί τῆς ὀλῆς*, from which we have a considerable extract, in Euseb. *Prepar. Evang.* vi. 22). Candidus and Appion explained the Hexæmeron, or six days' work, *Gen.* ch. i.; Sextus wrote on the resurrection; and Arabianus composed some doctrinal tracts.

Judas, of the same age, undertook a computation of the 70 weeks of Daniel; and brought down his history of events to A.D. 203. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 52, and Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 7.

Ammonius was probably an Egyptian Christian, nearly contemporary with Origen; and not the apostate philosopher Ammonius Saccas, under whom Origen studied, though confounded with him by Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19. and by Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 55. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* iv. p. 161 and 172, and Mosheim, *de Rebus Christianor.* p. 281, &c. He wrote a book on the agreement of Moses with Jesus, which is lost, and a *Harmony of the four Gospels*, which is supposed to be one of those still extant

in the *Biblioth. Max. Patrum*. But whether the larger *Harmony*, in tom. ii. pt. ii. or the smaller, in tom. iii. is the genuine work, has been doubted. See Gardner, *Credibility*, &c. pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 106, &c.

Tryphon, a disciple of Origen, is said by Jerome (*de Viris Illustr.* c. 57,) to have been very learned in the Scriptures, and to have written many epistles and tracts, and particularly a treatise concerning the red heifer, in the book of Num. ch. xix.; and another on the dividing of the birds in Abraham's sacrifice, Gen. xv. 10. Nothing of his is extant.

Symmachus, originally a Samaritan, then a Jew, and at last an Ebionite Christian, gave a free translation of the O. T. into Greek; and also defended the principles of the Ebionites, in a Commentary on Matthew's Gospel. See Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 17.

Narcissus was made bp. of Jerusalem A.D. 196. After four years of faithful service, he was falsely accused of immoral conduct; and, though generally accounted innocent, he voluntarily abdicated his office, and lived in retirement till A.D. 216, when he resumed his office, and continued in it till his martyrdom, A.D. 237. He was then 116 years old. See Euseb. *H. E.* vi. c. 9, 10, 11.

Alexander succeeded Narcissus A.D. 237, and held the chair 14 years. This eminent man was bishop of a church in Cappadocia, when called to the see of Jerusalem. He was a great patron of Origen; and wrote several epistles, from which extracts are preserved. After important services to the church, he died a martyr A.D. 251. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 62, and Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 11. 14. 19. 26. 39, and 46.

Firmilian, bp. of Cesarea in Cappadocia, was a great admirer and a disciple of Origen. He was a man of high eminence in the church, and died at Tarsus, on his way to the second council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata, about A.D. 266. A long and able epistle of his to Cyprian, on the rebaptism of heretics, is preserved in a Latin translation among the works of Cyprian, *Ep.* 75. See Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 26, 27. 46; and vii. 5. 29.

Pontius, a deacon of Carthage, attended Cyprian at his death, and wrote an account of his martyrdom, which has reached us, though perhaps inter-

polated. It is prefixed to Cyprian's works, and is found in Ruinart, *Acta Selecta Martyrum*. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 68. Pontius himself, it is said, suffered martyrdom shortly after; of which an account is extant, professedly written by his fellow-deacon Valerius; *apud Baluzii Miscell.* tom. ii. p. 124.

Cornelius, bp. of Rome, was elected June 2, A.D. 251, in opposition to Novatian; and, after fifteen months, died in banishment at Centumcellæ, (Civitas Vecchia,) Sept. 14, A.D. 252. In the works of Cyprian, there are extant two epistles of Cornelius to Cyprian, and ten epistles of Cyprian to Cornelius. Cyprian describes him (*Ep.* 52, ed. Baluz.) as an unimpeachable character,—a pious, sensible, modest man,—well qualified to be a bishop. Jerome (*de Viris Illustr.* c. 66,) mentions four epistles of Cornelius to Fabius, bp. of Antioch; and Eusebius gives us a long and valuable extract from one of them. *H. E.* vi. 43. See Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i.

Novatian, first a presbyter, and then the schismatical bp. of Rome, wrote, (according to Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 70,) *de Pascha*; *de Sabbato*; *de Circumcisione*; *de Sacerdote*; *de Oratione*; *de Cibis Judaicis* (extant, inter Opp. Tertulliani); *de Instantia*; *de Adulto*; *de Trinitate* (a large book, being an abridgment of a work of Tertullian, extant, inter Opp. Tertull.); and many other works. An epistle written by him to Cyprian, in the name of the Roman clergy, A.D. 250, is likewise extant (*inter Opp. Cypriani*, ep. 31, ed. Baluz.), and shows that he was a man of talents, and a good writer. His rival, Cornelius, describes him as a very bad man. See Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 43.

Stephen, bp. of Rome, A.D. 253—257, is chiefly famous for his presumptuous attempt to excommunicate Cyprian and many other bishops of Africa and the East, for rebaptizing converted heretics. See Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 2—5. 7. Cyprian, *Ep.* 70—75. Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i.

Sixtus II. bp. of Rome A.D. 257, 258, and a martyr, was more conciliatory than his predecessor. Euseb. vii. 5. 9. Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i. Various supposititious writings are extant under his name. The most noted is a series of 160 moral Apophthegms, translated by Rufinus. Jerome (on Ezek. c. 18, and elsewhere), and Augustine (*Retract.* l. ii.

c. 42), pronounce them the work of Sixtus, a pagan philosopher; which they probably are, notwithstanding U. G. Sieber, their editor, (Lips. 1725, 4to,) has laboured hard to fix them on this Roman bishop.

Dionysius, bp. of Rome A.D. 259—269, was a learned man, and a good bishop. See Basil, *Ep.* 220, and *de Sp. Sancto*, c. 29. Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 7. He wrote an epistle against the Sabellians, of which Athanasius (*de Synodi Nicænae decretis*) has preserved an extract; also an epistle to Dionysius of Alexandria, acquainting him with the dissatisfaction of a council of bishops at Rome, with some expressions concerning the Trinity used by that patriarch, and requesting of him an explanation, which was given in four Letters or Books. Athanasius, *pro Sententia Dionys. Alex.*, and Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 26. See Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i.

Malehion, a presbyter, and a teacher of philosophy at Antioch. He greatly distinguished himself in the third council, against Paul of Samosata, A.D. 269. Two previous councils had been unable to convict the crafty heretic; but in this, Malehion encountered him in presence of the council, while stenographers took down their dialogue. Paul was now convicted; and the Dialogue was published. Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 29. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 71.

Commodianus, a Christian poet, was probably an African and contemporary, or nearly so, with Cyprian. See Dodwell's *Diss. de Etate Commodiani*. He had a smattering of Greek and Latin learning, but was a weak though well-meaning man. His book comprises eighty paragraphs, called *Instructions*. It is written acrostically, and in a loose kind of hexameter: the style is rude, and the matter trite: the first half of the book is directed against the pagans; next he assails the unbelieving Jews; and then attempts to instruct all classes of Christians, and all ranks of ecclesiastical functionaries. It was first published by Rigaltius, subjoined to Cyprian's works, A.D. 1650; and again in 1666. The editions, with notes, by Schurtzffleisch, 1710, and of Davis, subjoined to his *Minucius Felice*, Camb. 1711, 8vo, are the best.

Anatolius, a very scientific ecclesiastic of Alexandria, who, by his address, once delivered his townsmen from a siege. He was made bp. of Laodicea in Syria, about A.D. 270, and published canons

for ascertaining Easter, from which Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 32), has preserved an extract; and Institutes of arithmetic, in ten books, of which some fragments still remain. Eusebius (l. c.) gives a long account of him. See also Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 73. What remains of his works has been published, Greek and Latin, by Bucherius, in his *Doctrina Temporum*, Antw. 1634, fol.

Archelaus, bp. of Carrhæ, in Mesopotamia, flourished about A.D. 278. He wrote in Syriac his disputation with Manes the heretic; which was early translated into Greek, and thence into Latin. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 72. A large part of the Latin copy was first published by Valesius, subjoined to Socrates, *Historia Eccles.*; afterwards, together with what remains of the Greek, by Zaccagnius, in his *Collection of rare Works of the Greek and Latin Church*, Rome, 1698, 4to, p. 1—102; and lastly, by Fabricius, ad finem *Opp. S. Hippolyti*, 2 vols. fol.

Pierius, a presbyter, and perhaps catechist of Alexandria. He was of Origen's school, very learned in the Scriptures, and wrote many discourses and expositions in a neat and simple style. He was called Origen Junior. His long discourse on the prophet Hosea is particularly noticed by Jerome. Photius (*Biblioth. cix.*) mentions twelve books of his expositions. He was of an ascetic turn, lived considerably into the fourth century, and spent his latter years at Rome. Nothing of his remains. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 76; and Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32.

Theognostus, of Alexandria, a friend of Origen, and perhaps successor to Pierius in the catechetical school. He wrote seven books of Hypotyposes; of which Photius (*Biblioth. cvi.*) has preserved an abstract. Photius deemed him heretical, in regard to the Trinity; but Athanasius makes quotations from him, in confutation of the Arians. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. ix. p. 403.

Lucian, a learned presbyter of Antioch. He adhered for some time to Paul of Samosata. To him most of the churches from Syria to Constantinople, were indebted for corrected copies of the Septuagint. Jerome mentions him as the author of several theological tracts and letters; and a confession of faith, drawn up by him, is still extant, in Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 10, and in Walch's *Biblioth. Symbol. Fetus*, p. 29, &c. He was a very pious man, and

suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia, A.D. 311.—See Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13, and ix. 6, and Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 77.

Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop and martyr, was famous at the same period for setting forth correct copies of the Septuagint in Egypt. Whether he was that Hesychius who compiled a useful Greek Lexicon, still extant, is uncertain. He died a martyr, A.D. 311. See Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13, and Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. iv. p. 554, &c.

Pamphilus the martyr, was a native of Berytus, but a presbyter of Caesarea in Palestine, where he established a school, and collected a theological library, which has been of immense service to the Christian world. This library afforded to Eusebius, Jerome, and many others, the means of becoming learned divines, and of benefiting the world by their writings. To this establishment, ecclesiastical history and biblical learning are peculiarly indebted.—Pamphilus was a pupil of Pierius, an admirer of Origen, and the great friend and patron of Eusebius. He transcribed most of the works of Origen, with his own hand; and he composed a biography and vindication of Origen, in five books, to which Eusebius added a sixth book. Only the

first book is now extant; and that in a Latin translation of Rufinus, printed *inter Opp. Origenis*.—Pamphilus took great pains to multiply and spread abroad correct copies of the Holy Scriptures.—His life was written by Eusebius, in three books, which are lost. He suffered martyrdom, A.D. 309, at Caesarea in Palestine. See Euseb. *de Martyribus Palestine*, c. 10 and 7, and *H. E.* vi. 32, vii. 32, and viii. 13. Jerome *de Viris Illustr.* c. 75.

Victorinus, bp. of Petavio in Upper Pammonia, (Petau in Steyermark,) wrote Commentaries on Gen. Exod. Levit. Isa. Ezek. Habak. Eccles. Cant. and the Apocalypse; also a book against all the Heresies. He died a martyr, A.D. 303. Jerome says, he understood Greek better than Latin; and, therefore, his thoughts are good, but his style is bad.—Dr. Cave (*Histor. Lit.* vol. i.) published a fragment of his Commentary on Genesis. Whether the Commentary on the Apocalypse, now extant under his name, be *his*, has been much doubted; because this comment is *opposed* to Chiliasm, whereas Jerome (*de Viris Illustr.* c. 18,) says, that Victorinus *favoured* the sentiments of Nepos and the Chiliasts.—See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 74. *Tr.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. State of Christian theology.—§ 2. Sources of the mystical theology.—§ 3. Thence the monks and Eremites.—§ 4. Attention to the Holy Scriptures.—§ 5. *Origen's* principles of interpretation.—§ 6. Other interpreters.—§ 7. State of dogmatic theology.—§ 8. Moral or practical theology.—§ 9. Polemic divines.—§ 10. Faults of the disputants.—§ 11. Spurious books.—§ 12. The Chiliastic controversy.—§ 13. Controversy respecting the baptism of reclaimed heretics.—§ 14. Disputes concerning *Origen*.

§ 1. To the common people the principal truths of Christianity were explained in their purity and simplicity, and all subtleties were avoided: nor were weak and tender minds overloaded with a multitude of precepts¹. But in their schools, and books, the doctors who cultivated literature and philosophy, especially those of Egypt, deemed it a mark of superior understanding and cultivation to subject divine wisdom to reason, or rather to the precepts of their philosophy, and to investigate a sort of interior sense in the doctrines taught by *Christ*. At the head of this class was *Origen*, who was led by love of the Platonic philosophy, to bring boldly every part of religion under its laws, and to persuade himself that his admired system could assign the causes and grounds of every doctrine, and determine its operation². He must, indeed, be acknowledged

¹ See *Origen*, in *Pref. libror. de Principiis*, tom. i. Opp. p. 49, and lib. i. *de Princip.* cap. vii. p. 69, ed. De la Rue; also Gregory Neocæsar. *Expositio Fidei*, p. 11, Opp. ed. G. Vossii.

² In his *Stromata*, which are lost, and in his work *de Principiis*, which is preserved in the Latin translation of Rufinus. — [See a long Note of Dr. Mosheim, on the philosophy and the theology of *Origen* in his *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 604, &c.—It does

not appear that *Origen* regarded reason or philosophy as of higher authority than revelation. He believed, indeed, that there is a true philosophy as well as a false, and that the dictates of the former are to be received and confided in. But he also believed that the Scriptures contain a divine revelation, which is to be received and followed with implicit confidence; and that no philosophy is true which contradicts the plain declarations of the Scriptures. At the same

to have proceeded in this matter with timidity and modesty for the most part; but his example sanctioned this faulty mode of treating theology, and led his disciples to burst the barriers that he prescribed, and to become very licentious in explaining divine truths according to the dictates of philosophy. To these

time he believed, that the Scriptures for the most part only state the simple truths and facts of religion, without explaining the grounds and reasons of them; and that they state these truths and facts in a plain and popular manner without acquainting us with the metaphysical nature of the subjects. In his opinion, it was the proper business of reason or philosophy to investigate more fully the causes and grounds of these religious truths and facts, and to examine and determine their metaphysical nature.—Such, it appears, were Origen's fundamental principles. And how few are they, who in this or in any age, have adopted more consistent views? Yet he erred; and erred, just as theologians have ever been prone to do, by relying too confidently on the correctness and certainty of that which he regarded as the conclusions of true philosophy. For an illustration of the nature and extent of Origen's errors, let it be observed, that in the beginning of his book *de Principiis*, § 3, p. 47, he gives the following list of fundamental truths, which he considers as plainly taught in the Scriptures, and of course as never to be called in question; viz. (1) There is one God, the creator and father of all. (2) He, in these last days, sent Christ to call first the Jews and then also other people. (3) Jesus Christ was begotten of the Father before all creatures, and he aided the Father in the whole work of creation. (4) The same Christ becoming man, was incarnate, though he was God; and having become man, he remained God, as he was before; he assumed a body like to ours, and differing only in this, that it was born of the Virgin and of the Holy Spirit; he really and truly suffered, died, and rose again. (5) The Holy Spirit, in honour and dignity, is joined with the Father and the Son. (6) All rational minds possess entire freedom of choice and volition, and when separated from the body, will be punished or rewarded according to their merits. (7) Our bodies will be raised in a far more perfect state. (8) The devil and his angels are realities, and they seek to involve men in sin. (9) This

world will be dissolved. (10) The Scriptures were dictated by the Spirit of God; and they contain a double sense, the one manifest, the other latent. (11) There are holy angels and powers, who minister to the salvation of men. These Origen gives as *specimens* only; for he says: *Hee sunt species (sorts or specimens) eorum, que per predicationem Apostolicam manifeste traduntur.* Now such general truths as these, Origen did not permit to be called in question for a moment. Yet, as before observed, their metaphysical nature, and the grounds and reasons of them, he supposed it the proper business of reason or philosophy to investigate. And his errors were nearly all in relation to religious philosophy, or ontology and metaphysics. He reasoned, and believed, according to the reigning philosophy of the age and country in which he lived. He therefore believed in the pre-existence of human souls, and their incarceration in bodies, for offences previously committed; that the senses are polluting to the soul, and must be all mortified; that all rational beings are left of God to follow their own choice, and are restrained only by motives, the most powerful of which is punishment; and that ultimately God will thus bring all his creatures to be wise and holy and happy. *Tr.*—Even devils were to be eventually purified by the penal processes which they are undergoing, and thus the final *restoration of all things* was to be the complete triumph of a purgatorial system over all the defections of God's rational creatures from his own inherent holiness. Huet, accordingly, (*Origéniana*, 153,) rightly concludes, that Origen admitted no future punishments, but such as are temporary and peculiar, the very nature assigned by Romanists to purgatorial inflictions. The prevalence of their doctrine owes, probably, much to this great man's *adamantine* powers, but he pushed it farther than Rome approves. His own adoption of it was, evidently of Platonic growth. See the Editor's *Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, being the Bampton Lecture for 1830, pp. 314. 339. *Ed.*]

divines, as the parents, that species of *theology* which is called philosophic or *scholastic*, owes its birth; but it afterwards assumed various forms according to the capacity and erudition of the men who delighted in it.

§ 2. It is a singular circumstance, that another species of *theology*, which has been denominated *mystic*, and which has a natural tendency to destroy the former, originated from the same sources, and nearly at the same time. Its authors are unknown; but its causes and the process of its formation are manifest. Its originators assumed that well-known doctrine of the Platonic school, which was approved also by *Origen* and his followers, that *a portion of the divine nature was diffused through all human souls*; or, to express the same thing in other words, that *reason in us is an emanation from God himself, and comprehends the elements or first principles of all truths human and divine*. Yet they denied that men, by their own efforts and care, can excite this divine spark within them; and, therefore, they disapproved of the endeavours of men to gain clear perceptions of latent truths by means of definitions, discrimination, and reflection. On the contrary, they maintained that silence, inaction, solitude, repose, the avoidance of all active scenes, and the mortification and subjugation of the body, tended to excite this *internal word* [*λόγος*, or *reason*], to put forth its hidden energies, and thus to instruct men in divine things. For the men who neglect all human affairs, and withdraw their senses and their eyes from the contagious influence of material objects, do spiritually, or with the mind, return to God again; and being united with God, they not only enjoy wonderful pleasure, but also see in its native purity and undisguised that truth which appears to others only in a vitiated and deformed state³.

§ 3. Such reasoning induced many in this age to retire into deserts, and to emaciate their bodies by fasting and hardships. And by such motives, rather than by fear of the Decian persecution, I suppose that *Paul* the hermit was led to roam in the deserts of Thebais, and to lead a life more proper for an irrational animal than for a human being⁴. This *Paul* is said

³ [In his *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 658–667, Dr. Mosheim endeavours to show, that *Origen*, by his religious philosophy, laid the foundations of mystic theology in the Christian

church. But the evidence he adduces is by no means conclusive. *Tr.*]

⁴ His life was written by *Jerome*. [See also the *Acta Sanctorum*, Antwerp, tom. i. January 10th, p. 662. *Schl.*]

to be the author of the institution of Eremites. But this mode of life prevailed among Christians long before *Paul* the hermit; in fact it was practised long before the Christian era, in Egypt, Syria, India, and Mesopotamia, and it still exists among the Mahometans, as well as the Christians in those arid and burning climates⁵. For the heated atmosphere which overspreads those countries naturally disposes the inhabitants to repose and indolence, and to court solitude and melancholy.

§ 4. Among those who laudably employed themselves on the sacred volume, the first place is due to such as took earnest care that copies of it might every where be found accurately written, and at a moderate price; that it might be translated into other languages; and that amended and faultless editions might become common. Many opulent Christians of those times are known to have expended no small portion of their estates in furtherance of these objects. In correcting the copies of the Septuagint version, *Pierius* and *Hesychius*, in Egypt, and *Lucian*, at Antioch, employed themselves with laudable industry. Nor should the nearly similar efforts of *Pamphilus* the martyr be passed without notice. But *Origen* surpassed all others in diligence and patient labour in this way. His *Hexapla*, though [nearly] destroyed by the ravages of time, will remain an eternal monument of the incredible application with which that great man laboured to serve the interests of Christianity⁶.

⁵ See the *Travels of Paul Lucas*, A.D. 1714, vol. ii. p. 363. [The reader will recollect the *Derwises* and *Fakirs*, who roam over the whole country from the shores of the Mediterranean to the Ganges.—Jerome reports, in the preface to his life of Paul of Thebais, on the questionable authority of Amathas and Macarius, two disciples of St. Anthony, that Paul the hermit of Thebais was the first who practised this mode of life. But high ideas of the sanctity of renouncing social and civilized life and dwelling in deserts among beasts, were prevalent, before Paul in the middle of this century turned hermit. Thus Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem, obtained great reputation, in the close of the second century, by secluding himself many years in the desert. Euseb. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 9, 10. The origin of religious eremitism may perhaps be traced back to the early pagan philosophers; for Porphyry (*περί ἀποχρῆς*, § 35,) assures us, that the ancient

Pythagoreans were distinguished for their attachment to this mode of life. *Tr.*]

⁶ The fragments of this Herculean work which are preserved, have been collected and published by that ornament of the once learned Benedictines, Bernh. de Montfaucon, Paris, 1713, 2 vols. fol. See also J. P. Buddeus, *Isagogæ in Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 1376, &c.; and J. G. Carpzov, *Critica Sacra Vol. Test.* p. 574.—[Origen published both a *Tetrapla* and a *Hexapla*; that is, a four-fold and a six-fold Bible. The former contained, in parallel columns, 1. Aquila's Greek version; 2. that of Symmachus; 3. the Septuagint version; 4. the Greek version of Theodotion. The *Hexapla* contained, throughout, *sic* columns, generally eight, and occasionally nine; thus arranged,—1. The Hebrew text in the Hebrew character; 2. the Hebrew text in Greek characters; 3. Aquila's version; 4. that of Symmachus; 5. the

§ 5. The same *Origen*, unquestionably, stands at the head of the interpreters of the Bible in this century. But with pain it must be added, that he was first among those who have found in the Scriptures a secure retreat for errors and idle fancies of all kinds. As this most ingenious man could see no feasible method of vindicating all that Scripture says, against the cavils of heretics and enemies of Christianity, if its language were interpreted literally, he concluded that he must expound the sacred volume upon the principles which the Platonists used in explaining the history of the gods. He therefore taught that the words in many parts of the Bible convey no meaning at all; and in places where he admitted certain ideas to lie under the terms used, he contended for a hidden and recondite sense of them, altogether different from their natural import, but far preferable to it⁷. And this hidden sense it is that he

Septuagint; 6. that of Theodotion; 7. and 8. two other Greek versions, the authors of which were unknown; 9. another Greek version. The three last, being anonymous versions, are denominated the *Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh* Greek versions. The most useful parts of Montfaucon's *Hexapla*, with additions, corrections, and notes, have been published in two vols, 8vo, by C. F. Bahrdt, Lips. 1769-70. *Tr.*]

⁷ Here may be consulted the Preface of Charles de la Rue to the second volume of Origen's works, ed. Paris, 1733, fol. With greater fulness and precision I have stated and explained Origen's system of biblical interpretation, in my *Comment. de Rebus Christianor. &c.* p. 629, where also his philosophy, his theology, and his contest with bishop Deme- trius, are formally taken up and discussed.—[With this may be compared the observations of that distinguished philologist, Professor Ernesti, in his *Dissertatio de Origene, interpretationis librorum SS. grammaticæ auctore*, written A.D. 1756. Ernesti shows that the merits of this Christian father, in regard to the criticism and exposition of the Old and New Testaments, were by no means small. The leading thoughts of Dr. Mosheim, as stated in his *Comment. de Rebus Christ. &c.* are the following. Origen was not the inventor of the allegorical mode of expounding the Scriptures. It was in use among the Jews before the Christian era. (Ernesti goes farther,

and seeks its origin in the schools of the prophets.) Philo was a great allegorist; and Pantænus and Clemens Alex. were the first Christian allegorists. Origen took greater liberties in this mode of interpretation; and it was not simply his resorting to allegories, but his excesses in them, that drew upon him enemies. Before his day, all interpreters explained the narrations and the laws contained in the Bible, according to their literal meaning. But Origen perversely turned a large part of biblical history into moral fables, and many of the laws into allegories. Probably he learned this in the school of Ammonius, which expounded Hesiod, Homer, and the whole fabulous history of the Greeks allegorically. The predecessors of Origen, who searched after a mystical sense of Scripture, still set a high value on the grammatical or literal sense; but he often expresses himself as if he attached no value to it. Before him, allegories were resorted to, only to discover predictions of future events, and rules for moral conduct; but he betook himself to allegories, in order to establish the principles of his philosophy on a scriptural basis. All this must have been offensive to many Christians. His propensity to allegories must be ascribed to the fertility of his invention, the prevailing custom of the Egyptians, his education, the instructions he received from his teachers, and the example both of the philosophers, of whom he was an admirer, and of the Jews,

searches after in his commentaries, ingeniously indeed, but perversely, and generally to the entire neglect and contempt of

especially Philo. To these may be added other causes. He hoped, by means of his allegories, more easily to convince the Jews, to confute the Gnostics, and to silence the objections of both. This he himself tells us, *de Principiis*, l. viii. c. 8. p. 164, &c. But we must not forget his attachment to that system of philosophy which he embraced. This philosophy could not be reconciled with the Scriptures, except by a resort to allegories; and, therefore, the Scriptures must be interpreted allegorically, that they might not contradict his philosophy. The Platonic idea of a twofold world, a visible and an invisible, and the one emblematic of the other, led him to search for a figurative description of the invisible world, in the biblical history of the nations of the earth. He also believed that it was doing honour to the Holy Scriptures, to consider them as diverse from all human compositions, and as containing hidden mysteries. See his *Homil.* xv. on *Genesis*, Opp. tom. ii. p. 99; and *Homil.* on *Eccl.* Opp. tom. ii. p. 129: And finally, he thought that many of the objections of the enemies of religion could not be fully answered without recurrence to allegories. His general principles for the interpretation of the sacred volume, resolve themselves into the following positions. 1. The Scriptures resemble man. As a man consists of three parts, a rational mind, a sensitive soul, and a visible body; so the Scriptures have a threefold sense, a *literal* sense, corresponding with the body, a *moral* sense, analogous to the soul, and a *mystical* or *spiritual* sense, analogous to the rational mind. *Homil.* v. on *Levit.* § 5, Opp. tom. ii. p. 209. 2. As the body is the baser part of man, so the *literal* is the less worthy sense of Scripture. And as the body often betrays good men into sin, so the *literal* sense often leads us into error. *Stromata*, l. x. quoted by Jerome, b. iii. *Comment.* on *Galat.* ch. iii. Opp. tom. i. p. 41. 3. Yet the *literal* sense is not wholly useless. *De Principiis*, l. iv. § 12, p. 169, and § 14, p. 173. 4. They who would see farther into the Scriptures than the common people, must search out the *moral* sense. 5. And the perfect, or those who have attained to the highest degree of blessedness, must also investigate the *spiritual* sense. *De Prin-*

ciptis, l. iv. § 2, p. 168. 6. The *moral* sense of Scripture instructs us relative to the changes in the mind of man, and gives rules for regulating the heart and life. 7. The *spiritual* sense acquaints us with the nature and state and history of the *spiritual* world. For, besides this material world, there is a spiritual world, composed of two parts, the heavenly and the earthly. The *earthly*, mystical or spiritual world, is the Christian church on earth. The *heavenly*, mystical world is above; and corresponds in all its parts with the lower world, which was formed after its model. 8. As the Scripture contains the history of this twofold mystic world, so there is a twofold mystic sense of Scripture, an *allegorical* and an *anagogical*. 9. The *mystic* sense is diffused throughout the Holy Scriptures. 10. Yet we do not always meet with both the allegorical sense and the anagogical, in every passage. 11. The *moral* sense likewise pervades the whole Bible. 12. But the *literal* sense does not occur every where: for many passages have no literal meaning. 13. Some passages have only two senses; namely, a *moral* and a *mystical* [the *mystical* being either *allegorical* or *anagogical*, rarely both]; other passages have three senses [the *moral*, the *mystical*, and the *literal*]. 14. The *literal* sense is perceived by every attentive reader. The *moral* sense is somewhat more difficult to be discovered. 15. But the *mystic* sense none can discover with certainty, unless they are wise men, and also taught of God. 16. Neither can even such men hope to fathom all the mysteries of the sacred volume. 17. In searching for the *anagogical* sense, especially, a person must proceed with peculiar care and caution. *Schl.*—Dr. Mosheim states the following as Origen's general rule for determining when a passage of Scripture may be taken literally, and when not: viz. Whenever the words, if understood literally, will afford a valuable meaning, one that is worthy of God, useful to men, and accordant with truth and correct reason, then the *literal* meaning is to be retained: but whenever the words, if understood literally, will express what is absurd, or false, or contrary to correct reason, or useless, or unworthy of God, then the *literal* sense is to be discarded, and

the literal meaning⁸. This remote sense he moreover divides into the *moral* and the *mystical* or *spiritual*; the former containing instruction relative to the internal state of the soul and our external actions, and the latter acquainting us with the nature, the history, and the laws of the *spiritual* or *mystical world*. He fancied that this *mystical world* was also twofold, partly *superior* or *celestial*, and partly *inferior* and *terrestrial*, that is, the church: and hence he divided the mystical sense of Scripture into the *terrene* or *allegorical*, and the *celestial* or *anagogical*. This mode of interpreting Scripture, which was sanctioned by Jewish practice, was current among Christians before the times of *Origen*. But as he gave determinate rules for it, and brought it into a systematic form, he is commonly regarded as its originator.

§ 6. Innumerable expositors in this and the following centuries pursued the method of *Origen*, though with some diversity; nor could the few who pursued a better method, make much head against them. The commentaries of *Hippolytus*, which have reached us, show that this holy man went entirely into *Origen's* method. And no better, probably, were the expositions of some books of the Old and New Testaments, composed by *Victorinus*, but which are now lost. But the *Paraphrase on the book of Ecclesiastes*, by *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, which is still extant, is not liable to the same objection, although its author was a great admirer of *Origen*. *Methodius*

the moral and mystical alone to be regarded. This rule he applies to every part both of the Old Test. and the New. And he assigns two reasons why fables and literal absurdities are admitted into the sacred volume. The *first* is, that if the literal meaning were always rational and good, the reader would be apt to rest in it, and not look after the moral and mystical sense. The *second* is, that fabulous and incongruous representations often afford moral and mystical instruction, which could not so well be conveyed by sober facts and representations. *De Principiis*, l. iv. § 15, 16, tom. x. *Comment. in Joh. Tr.*]

⁸ *Origen*, in his *Stromata*, l. x. cited by Ch. de la Rue, *Opp.* tom. i. p. 41, says: *Multorum multorum occasio est, si quis in carne Scripturæ maneat. Quæ qui fecerint, regnum Dei non consequentur. Quamobrem spiritum Scripturæ fructus-*

que queramus, qui non dicuntur manifesti. He had said a little before: *Non calide eos jucat Scriptura, qui eam intelligunt, ut scriptum est.* Who would suppose such declarations could fall from the lips of a wise and considerate man! But this excellent man suffered himself to be misled by the causes mentioned, and by his love of philosophy. He could not discover in the sacred books all that he considered true, so long as he adhered to the literal sense; but allow him to abandon the literal sense, and to search for recondite meanings, and those books would contain Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and the whole tribe of philosophers. And thus, nearly all those who would model Christianity according to their own fancy, or their favourite system of philosophy, have run into this mode of interpreting Scripture.

explained the book of Genesis, and the Canticles; but his labours have not reached us. *Ammonius* composed a Harmony of the Gospels.

§ 7. *Origen*, in his lost work entitled *Stromata*, and in his four books *de Principiis*, explained most of the doctrines of Christianity, or, to speak more correctly, deformed them with philosophical speculations. And these his books *de Principiis* were the first compendium of scholastic, or, if you please, philosophic theology. Something similar was attempted by *Theognostus*, in his seven books of *Hypotyposes*; for a knowledge of which we are indebted to *Photius*⁹, who says that they were the work of a man infected with the opinions of *Origen*. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, in his *Expositio Fidei*, gave a brief summary of Christian doctrines. Certain points of the Christian faith were taken up by various individuals, in reply to the enemies or the corrupters of Christianity. Tracts on the Deity, the resurrection, antichrist, and the end of the world, were composed by *Hippolytus*. *Methodius* wrote on free-will; and *Lucian* on the creed. But as most of these treatises are no longer extant, their characters are little known.

§ 8. Among the writers on moral subjects (or practical theology), passing by *Tertullian*, who was mentioned under the preceding century, the first place belongs perhaps to *Cyprian*. From the pen of this extraordinary man we have treatises on the *advantages of patience*, on *mortality*, on *alms and good works*, and an *exhortation to martyrdom*. In these works there are many excellent thoughts, but they are not arranged neatly and happily, nor sustained by solid arguments¹. *Origen* wrote, among other works of a practical nature, an *exhortation to martyrdom*; a topic discussed by many in that age, with different degrees of eloquence and perspicacity. *Methodius* treated of chastity, but in a confused manner, in his *Fest of Virgins*. *Dionysius*, of Alexandria, wrote on *penance* and on *temptations*. To mention other writers in this department would be needless.

§ 9. Of polemic writers, a host might be mentioned. The

⁹ [*Photius*, *Biblioth.* cod. cvi. p. 279. *Photius* represents him as erring, with *Origen*, in regard to the character of the Son of God. But G. Bull defends him against this charge, in his *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ*, sec. 2, c. 10, § 7, p. 135.

—See concerning him, *Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Gr.* l. v. c. 1, vol. v. p. 276, and l. v. c. 88, vol. ix. p. 408. *Schl.*]

¹ See J. Barbeyrac, *de la Morale des Pères*, c. viii. p. 104, &c.

idolaters were assailed by *Minucius Felix*, in his dialogue entitled *Octavius*; by *Origen*, in his eight books *against Celsus*; by *Arnobius*, in his eight books *against the Gentiles*; and by *Cyprian*, in his tract *on the Vanity of Idols*. The *Chronicon* of *Hippolytus*, written against the Gentiles; and the work of *Methodius* in opposition to *Porphyry*, who attacked Christianity, are lost. We may also place among polemic writers, both those who wrote against the philosophers, as *Hippolytus*, who wrote against *Plato*, and those who treated of *fate*, of *free-will*, and of the *origin of evil*, as *Hippolytus*, *Methodius*, and others. Against the Jews, *Hippolytus* attempted something, which has not reached us; but the *Testimonies* [from Scripture] *against the Jews*, by *Cyprian*, are still extant. Against all the sectarians and heretics, assaults were made by *Origen*, *Victorinus*, and *Hippolytus*, but nothing of these works has come down to us. It would be superfluous here to enumerate those who wrote against individual heretics.

§ 10. But it must by no means pass unnoticed; that the discussions instituted against the opposers of Christianity in this age, departed far from the primitive simplicity, and the correct method of controversy. For the Christian doctors, who were in part educated in the schools of rhetoricians and sophists, inconsiderately transferred the arts of these teachers to the cause of Christianity; and therefore considered it of no importance whether an antagonist were confounded by artifice or solid argument. Thus that mode of disputing, which the ancients called *economical*², and which had victory rather than truth for its object, was almost universally approved. And the Platonists contributed to the currency of the practice, by asserting that it was no sin in a person to employ falsehood and fallacies for the support of truth, when it was in danger of being borne down. Any one ignorant of these facts will be but a poor judge of the arguments of *Origen* in his book *against Celsus*, and of the others who wrote against the worshippers of idols. *Tertullian's* method of confuting heretics, namely by *prescription*, was not perhaps altogether unsuitable

² Souverain, *Platonisme décollé*, p. 244. J. Duille, *de vero Usu Patrum*, l. i. p. 160. J. C. Wolfii *Cusauboniana*, p. 100. On the phrase to do a thing *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, Tho. Gataker has treated largely, in his notes on *M. Au-*

tonianus, l. xi. p. 330, &c. [It signifies to do a thing artfully and dexterously, or with cunning and sagacity, as a shrewd manager of a household (*οἰκονόμος*) controls those under him. Tr.]

in that age. But they who think it always proper to reason in this manner, must have little knowledge of the difference which time and change of circumstances produce³.

§ 11. This vicious disposition to circumvent and confound an adversary, rather than confute him with sound argument, produced also a multitude of books falsely bearing on their fronts the names of certain distinguished men. For a great part of mankind being influenced more by authorities, than by reasons and divine declarations, individuals endeavoured to stifle opposition, by pretending to derive their opinions from the most venerable sources. Hence those *Canons* which were falsely ascribed to the apostles⁴: hence those *Apostolic Constitutions* which *Clemens Romanus* was reputed to have collected⁵: hence, too, the *Recognitions of Clement*⁶, as they are called,

³ See Fred. Spanheim, *Diss. de Prescriptione in Rebus Fidei*, Opp. tom. iii. p. 1079.—[Tertullian's book was entitled *de Prescriptione Hæreticorum*, or *Prescriptionibus adversus Hæreticos*; which might be translated, on the *Presumption* in regard to heretics, or *Presumptions* against them. The author attempts to confute all the heretics at once, and by means of historical arguments. He maintains that the orthodox churches were founded by the apostles and their approved assistants, who ordained the first pastors of these churches, and established in them all one and the same faith, which must of course be genuine Christianity; and that this faith, having been handed down pure and uncorrupted, is now contained in the creeds and inculcated in the assemblies of these churches. But that not one of these things can be said of the heretical churches, which had not such an origin, and embraced various differing creeds, and creeds derived from other sources. Being bred an advocate, and familiar with the proceedings of courts, he gives a forensic form to his argument, not only by using the law term *Prescriptio*, but by maintaining that the orthodox were, and had always been, in right and lawful possession of that invaluable treasure, true Christianity; and that of course, the heretics, who were never in possession of it, in vain attempt now to *oust* them of what they thus hold by legal *prescription*. Tr.]

⁴ [The *Apostolic Canons* are eighty-five ecclesiastical laws or rules, professedly enacted by the apostles, and

collected and preserved by *Clemens Romanus*. The matter of them is ancient; for they describe the customs and institutions of Christians, particularly of the Greek and Oriental churches, in the *second* and *third* centuries. But the phraseology indicates a compiler living in the *third* century. See W. Beveridge's notes on these Canons, and his *Code Canonum Eccles. Primitivæ vindicatus et illustrat.* London, 1678, 4to. *Schd.*]

⁵ [The *Apostolic Constitutions* fill eight books. They prescribe the constitution, organization, discipline, and worship of the church, with great particularity; and avowedly are the work of the apostles themselves. But they are supposed to have been compiled in the eastern or Greek church, in the latter part of the *third*, or beginning of the *fourth* century. Some place them in the fourth or fifth century. They bear marks of an Arian hand. As describing the form, discipline, and ceremonies of the church about the year 300, they are of some value. They may be seen in *Cotelærii Patres Apostolici*, tom. ii. Tr.]

⁶ [The *Recognitions*, of which we have only the Latin translation of Rufinus, compose ten books, and describe the travels of the apostle Peter, and his contests with Simon Magus. The work is a pleasant one to read, and helps us to understand the doctrines of the Gnostics. Dr. Mosheim (*Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesia*, § 34) conjectures, with much probability, that it was composed by an Alexandrian Jew, who was opposed to the Gnostics,

and the *Clementina*⁷, and other works of the like character, which a too credulous world long held in high estimation. By the same artifice the *mystics*, as they are called, sought to advance their cause. Having no answer to give to those who demanded who was the first author of this new sort of wisdom, they alleged that they received it from *Dionysius*, the Areopagite of Athens, a contemporary with the apostles; and to give plausibility to the falsehood, they palmed upon this great man books void of sense and rationality⁸. Thus, they who wished to surpass all others in piety deemed it pious to employ deception and fraud in support of piety.

§ 12. Among the controversies which divided Christians in this century, the most considerable turned upon the *millennium*, the *baptism of heretics*, and *Origen*. That the Saviour is to reign a thousand years among men before the end of the world, had been believed by many in the preceding century, without offence to any: all, however, had not explained the doctrine in the same manner, nor indulged hopes of the same kind of pleasures during that reign⁹. In this century the millennarian

but himself full of errors, under the forged name of Clemens Romanus. *Schl.*]

⁷ [The *Clementina* are nineteen Homilies, first published, Gr. and Lat., by Cotelier, in his *Patres Apostol.* tom. i. p. 603, &c. They are supposed to have been the work of some Ebionite. *Schl.*—The *Clementina* and the *Recognitions* are works of a similar character. Both profess to give us the history of St. Peter's contests with Simon Magus, and his private instructions to his particular friends, respecting the mysteries of nature and the deep things of theology. They are downright romance, yet not uninteresting, as specimens of the speculations of semi-Christians of a philosophic turn, who lived about A.D. 200. *Tr.*]

⁸ [The spurious works ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, (who is mentioned *Acts* xvii. 34,) are the following: *de Celesti Hierarchia*, lib. i.; *de Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, l. i.; *de Divinis Nominibus*, l. i.; *de Mystica Theologia*, l. i.; together with four Epistles to Caius, one to Dorotheus, one to Sospater, one to Polycarp, one to Demophylus, one to Titus, one to Apollonides, and two to St. John the apostle. They all relate to the mystic theology, and breathe a

devout spirit, but are exceedingly obscure and difficult of comprehension. It is supposed they were written in the fourth or fifth century, as they bear marks of that period, and are not mentioned by any writer prior to the sixth century. During the middle ages they were held in high estimation, and their genuineness scarcely if at all questioned. The more devout Roman Catholics, and most of the early Protestants, received them and relied upon them as genuine. In the 17th century, their spuriousness was abundantly demonstrated, and they are now universally regarded as supposititious. The best edition of these works, Gr. and Lat., with copious notes, is that of *Balthazar Corderius*, Antwerp, 1634, 2 vols. fol. embracing the Greek scholia of St. Maximus the martyr (A.D. 659), and the paraphrase of George Pachymeras (A.D. 1280). The MS. copies of these works are found in most of the great libraries of Europe. *Tr.*]

⁹ [“See the learned *Treatise concerning the true Millennium*, which Dr. Whitby has subjoined to the second volume of his *Commentary upon the New Testament*. See also, for an account of the doctrine of the ancient Millennarians, the fourth, fifth, seventh and ninth volumes of Lardner's *Credibility*, &c.” *Mach.*—

doctrine fell into disrepute, through the influence especially of *Origen*, who opposed it because it contravened some of his opinions¹. But *Nepos*, an Egyptian bishop, attempted to revive its authority, in a work written *against the allegorists*, as he contemptuously styled the opposers of the millennium. The book and its arguments were approved by many in the province of Arsinoë, and particularly by *Coracion*, a presbyter of some respectability and influence. But *Dionysius* of Alexandria, a disciple of *Origen*, allayed the rising storm by his oral discussions and his two books *on the divine promises*².

also II. Corodt's *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus*, 2nd ed. 1794, 3 vols. 8vo. Tr.]

¹ See Origen, *de Principiis*, lib. ii. c. 11. Opp. tom. i. p. 104, and *Prolog. Comment. in Cantic. Cantieor.* tom. iii. p. 28.—[The Corinthians, Marcionites, Montanists, and Melitians, among the heretical sects, and among the orthodox fathers Papias, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, held to a millennial reign of Christ, and Irenæus understood it in a very gross sense. Dr. Mosheim, in his *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* &c. p. 721, believed that the doctrine had a Jewish origin; and he supposed the Christian doctors to have received, or at least tolerated it, because they hoped by it to make the Jews more willing to embrace Christianity. But Dr. Wadch, in his *Entwurf einer vollständigen Hist. der Ketzerereyen*, vol. ii. p. 143, is more discriminating, and maintains that the question, whether a millennial reign of Christ is to be expected, had a biblical origin, the earlier Chiliasts relying on the testimony of the *Apocalypse*; but the explanation of the doctrine was derived from the Jewish opinions. There were two kinds of Chiliasts, the gross and the refined. The latter placed the chief differences between the millennial reign of Christ and his present reign, in the higher enjoyment of spiritual advantages and pleasures, yet without wholly excluding the pleasures of sense. But the former expected, in the millennium, all kinds of sensual delights, and the free indulgence of all, even the most exorbitant lusts. And these gross Chiliasts are to be found not merely among the heretics; they may be found also among the orthodox, as the example of Irenæus proves. According to the account of Gemadinus of Marsilles, *de Dogmatt. Ecclesiast.* c. 55, p. 32, the Chiliasts may

be divided into four classes. The first class were the most moderate. They are called Melitians; and expected a fulfilment of the divine promises here on the earth, without attempting to define the nature of the bliss to be enjoyed during the millennium. The second class expected not only to enjoy the indispensable indulgences of appetite, but also marriage pleasures, and every species of sensual indulgence. The third class promised themselves indeed sensitive delights, and these too as rewards for foregoing them now, and as a compensation for the outward sufferings of saints; but they excluded from them the carnal pleasure of sexual intercourse. The fourth was composed of *Nepos* and his followers. The millennial doctrine did not prevail every where, and uncontradicted. Yet the believers and the rejecters of the doctrine treated each other with affection, and a person might believe or discard it, without bringing his orthodoxy under suspicion. The first open opposer of Chiliasm that we meet with, was Caius, a teacher in the church of Rome, towards the end of the second century. He denied that the *Apocalypse* was written by John, and ascribed it rather to Cerinthus. But he effected very little. Origen was a more powerful opposer of the doctrine. He did not, like Caius, deny the canonical authority of the *Apocalypse*, but explained the passages in it which describe the millennial reign of Christ, allegorically, as referring to spiritual delights, suited to the nature of spirits raised to perfection, and these to be enjoyed, not on the earth, but in the world to come. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 720, &c. and Dr. Wadch, *Historie der Ketzerereyen*, vol. ii. p. 136—151. Schl.]

² See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vii. 24,

§ 13. As no law determined in what manner those who came over from heretical churches to the Catholic Christians were to be received, usage in this matter was not uniform. Many of the Orientals and Africans classed reclaimed heretics among catechumens, and admitted them to the Christian ordinances by baptism. But most of the Europeans judged the baptism of erring Christians to be valid; and therefore received reclaimed heretics simply with imposition of hands and prayer. This diversity long produced no contention. But in this century the Asiatic Christians determined in several councils what before had been left at discretion, that all heretics coming over to the true church must be re-baptized³. This coming to the knowledge of *Stephen*, bishop of Rome, he with little humanity or prudence excluded those Asiatics from communion with him and his church. Notwithstanding, however, *Cyprian*, with other Africans, in a council called on the subject, embraced the opinion of the Asiatics, and gave notice of it to *Stephen*. Upon this, *Stephen* was very indignant; but *Cyprian* replied with energy, and in a new council at Carthage, again pronounced the baptism of heretics wholly invalid. *Stephen's* anger now became heavier, and he excluded with great unkindness the Africans from the rights of brotherhood. The discord was healed, partly by the moderation of the Africans, partly by the death of *Stephen*⁴.

§ 14. The Origenian contests were moved by *Demetrius*,

and Gennadius Massiliensis, *de Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis*, cap. 55, p. 32, ed. Elmenhorst. — [Nepos held the *Apocalypse* to be an inspired book; and he maintained, in opposition to the allegorists, that the passages which speak of a millennial reign of Christ, must be understood literally, and as promising corporeal and sensitive pleasures. But he does not appear to have defined clearly what these pleasures were to be, though he excluded eating and drinking and marriage, as Dr. Mosheim supposes, l. c. p. 726. The very obscure and defective history of Nepos, and the controversy with him, is explained, as far as it can be, by Dr. Walch, l. c. p. 152—167. *Schl.*]

³ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vii. c. 5 and 7. Firmilian, *Epist. ad Cyprianum*, inter *Epp. Cyprian.* 75.—[The councils which decided this point, before *Stephen's* rash procedure, were (1) the

council of Carthage, about A.D. 215. See *Epp. Cypri.* 71 and 73.—(2) that of Ieonium in Phrygia, A.D. 235. *Epp. Cypri.* 75. Euseb. *II. E.* vii. 4.—(3) that of Synada, and (4) some others, which are barely mentioned in *Epp. Cypri.* 75, and Euseb. *ubi supra*. See Walch, *Historie der Kirchensamml.* p. 91, 94, and 96. *Tr.*]

⁴ *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 70 and 73, and several others, ed. Baluze. Augustine, *de Baptismo contra Donatistas*, l. vi. and vii. *Opp.* tom. ix. where he gives the acts of the council of Carthage, A.D. 256. Prudent. Maran, *Vita Cypriani*, p. 107, and all the writers of the life of *Cyprian*. [The whole history of this controversy is discussed at large by Dr. Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus*, § c. p. 540—547, and still more fully by Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzerereyen*, vol. ii. p. 328—334. *Schl.*]

bishop of Alexandria, whom Origen's friends represent as influenced by envy and hatred; which, however, is very doubtful. In the proceedings of Demetrius against Origen, one may discover marks of a mind exasperated, impassioned, arrogant, and unreasonable, but none scarcely of envy⁵. In the year 228, *Origen* undertook a journey to Achaia, and on his way suffered himself to be ordained presbyter by the bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem. At this, *Demetrius* was greatly offended, because he deemed *Origen* unfit for such an office, on account of his having emasculated himself; and because, being master of a school under him, he had been ordained without his knowledge and consent. The matter, however, was compromised, and Origen returned to Alexandria. But not long after, from some unknown cause, new dissension arose between him and Demetrius, which became so great, that Origen left Alexandria and the school in the year 231, and removed to Cæsarea in Palestine. Demetrius accused him in his absence before an assembled council, and deprived him of his office without a hearing, and afterwards, in a second council divested him of his priestly character. It is probable that Demetrius accused Origen before the council, particularly the last one, of erroneous sentiments in matters of religion; which it was easy for him to do, as *Origen's* book *de Principiis*, which was full of dangerous sentiments, had been published not long before. The decision of the Alexandrian council was approved by a majority of the Christian bishops, though rejected by those of Achaia, Palestine, Phœnicia, and Arabia⁶.

⁵ [Dr. Mosheim is singular in this opinion, which he defends at great length, in his *Comment. de Ricus*, &c. p. 671, &c. in opposition to the express testimony of Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 8, and Jerome, *Epist.* 29. Opp. tom. iv. pt. ii. p. 68. If Demetrius was not envious of the growing reputation of Origen, or otherwise affected by personal antipathy, it seems impossible to account for the rancour that he manifested. *Tr.*]

⁶ This account is derived from the original sources, especially from Euse-

bis, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 23. Photius, *Biblioth. cod.* cxviii. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* and Origen himself. It differs, in some respects, from that given by the common writers, Doucin, Huet, and others. [That Demetrius accused Origen of erroneous sentiments, is a mere conjecture of Dr. Mosheim. The early writers mention nothing of it, but state distinctly other charges as adduced by the persecuting bishop.—And that Demetrius assembled two councils, is not clear: see Walch, *Historie der Kirchenversamml.* p. 92, &c. *Tr.*]

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS RITES.

§ 1. Rites multiplied.—§ 2. Public worship.—§ 3. Administration of the sacred supper.—§ 4. Baptism.—§ 5. Various other rites.

§ 1. ALL the monuments of this century which have come down to us, show that there was a great increase of ceremonies. To the causes of this, which have already been mentioned, may be added the passion for Platonic philosophy, or rather, the popular superstition of the oriental nations respecting demons, which was adopted by the Platonists, and received from them by the Christian doctors. For, from these opinions concerning the nature and propensities of attendant spirits, many rites evidently took their rise. Hence arose public exorcisms, multiplication of fasts, and aversion to matrimony. Hence the caution not to have intercourse with those who were either not yet baptized, or had been excluded from the communion of the church; because such were considered as under the power of some evil spirit. And to pass over other things, hence the painful austerities and penances which were enjoined upon offenders¹.

§ 2. That the Christians now had in most provinces certain edifices in which they assembled for religious worship, will be denied by no candid and impartial person. Nor would I contend, strenuously, against those who think these edifices to have been generally now adorned with images and other ornaments². As to the forms of public worship, and the times³ set apart for it, it is unnecessary here to be particular, as little

¹ Whoever desires to look farther into this subject, may consult Porphyry, on *Abstinence from Flesh*; and various passages in Eusebius, *Preparat. Evang.* and Theodoret; comparing them with the Christian institutions.

² [Yet there is most ground for the negative. *Von Ein.*]

³ [The regular seasons for public worship were, all Sundays, Good Friday, Easter, and Whitsunday. See Origen, *aj. Celsus*, book viii. p. 833. The anni-

alteration was made in this century. Yet two things deserve notice. *First*, the public discourses to the people underwent a change. For, not to mention *Origen*, who was the first, so far as we know, that made long discourses in public, and in such discourses expounded the sacred volume, there were certain bishops, who being educated in the schools of the rhetoricians, framed their addresses and exhortations according to the rules of Grecian eloquence; and their example met with most ready approbation. *Secondly*, the use of incense was now introduced, at least into many churches. Very learned men have denied this fact; but they do it in the face of testimony altogether unexceptionable⁴.

§ 3. Those who had the direction of religious worship, annexed longer prayer and more of ceremony to the celebration of the Lord's Supper; and this I suppose, with no bad intentions. Neither those doing penance, nor those not yet baptized, were allowed to be present at the celebration of this ordinance; which practice, it is well known, was derived from the pagan mysteries⁵. That golden and silver vessels were used in it, is testified by *Prudentius*⁶, among others; and I see no reason to doubt the fact, in respect to the more opulent Christian churches. The time of its administration was different, according to the state and circumstances of the churches. Some deemed the morning, some the afternoon, and some the evening, to be the most suitable time for its celebration⁷. Neither were all agreed how often this most sacred ordinance should be repeated⁸. But all believed it absolutely necessary

versaries of the local martyrdoms were also observed. *Von Ein.*]

⁴ Wm. Beveridge, *ad Canon.* iii. *Apostol.* p. 461; and his *Codex Canon. vindicatus*, p. 78. [The Christians originally abhorred the use of incense in public worship, as being a part of the worship of idols. See *Tertullian, Apolog.* c. 42; and *de Corona militis*, c. 10. Yet they permitted its use at funerals, against offensive smells. Afterwards it was used at the induction of magistrates and bishops, and also in public worship to temper the bad air of crowded assemblies in hot countries, and at last degenerated into a superstitious rite. *Schl.*]

⁵ [See *Christ. Mathl.* Pfaff, *diss.* 2, *de Prejudic. Theolog.* § 13, p. 149, &c.; and *Jos. Bingham, Antiquitates Eccles.* l. x. c. 5. *Schl.*]

⁶ *Ἕπερ στέφανον.* Hymn ii. p. 60, ed. Heinsii, [and Optatus Milevit. *de Schismate Donatist.* c. 12, p. 17. *Schl.*—The heathen prefect in *Prudentius* only mentions the use of costly vessels by Christians as a report, but the rumour was probably not without some ground.

⁶ Hunc esse vestris orgiis
Morenque et artem proditum est,
Hanc disciplinam fœderis,
Libent ut auro antistites,
Argenteis scyphis ferunt
Funare sacrum sanguinem,
Auroque nocturnis sacris
Astare fixos cereos.⁷

Aurel. Prudent. ed. Valpy, p. 183. *Ed.*]

⁷ [See *Cyprian, Ep.* 63, p. 104. *Schl.*]

⁸ [It was commonly administered every Sunday, as well as on other fes-

to the attainment of salvation; and therefore every where would have even infants partake of it⁹. Sacred feasts, in some places, preceded it, in others, followed¹.

§ 4. *Baptism* was publicly administered twice a year to candidates who had gone through a long preparation and trial², none looking on but such as had been themselves already baptized. The effect of baptism was supposed to be the remission of sins: and the bishop, by the imposition of hands and prayer, it was believed, conferred those gifts of the Holy Spirit which were necessary for living a holy life³. Of the principal ceremonies attending baptism, we have before spoken⁴. A few things, however, must here be added. None were admitted to the sacred font until the exorcist had, with long and menacing formality, declared them no longer servants to the prince of darkness, but of God. For, after the opinion had become prevalent among Christians, that rational souls originated from God himself, and therefore were in themselves holy, pure, and morally free, the evil propensities of man must be considered as arising from the body and from matter, or some evil spirit must be supposed to possess the souls of men and impel them to sin. The Gnostics all embraced the first supposition; but the catholics could in no wise embrace it, because they held that matter was created by God, and was not eternal. They had, therefore, to embrace the second supposition, and to imagine some evil demon, the author of sin and of all evil, to be resident in all vicious persons⁵. The persons baptized,

tival days: and in times of persecution, daily. See Cyprian, *de Oratone Domini*, p. 209. *Ep.* 56, p. 90, ep. 54, p. 78, ed. Baluze. *Schl.*]

⁹ [They believed that this ordinance rendered persons immortal; and that such as never partook of it, had no hopes of a resurrection. Hence Dionysius Alex. (cited by Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 11,) calls it, αἰσθητὴν μετὰ τοῦ Κυρίου συν-αγωγὴν. That children also partook of it, is testified by Cyprian, *de Lapsis*, p. 184 and 189, ed. Baluze. See P. Horn's *Historia Eucharist. Infantum*, c. 4, § 1, &c.; and c. 6, § 3; also J. Bingham, *Antiquitates Eccles.* book xv. ch. 4, § 7. *Schl.*]

¹ [Chrysostom, *Homil.* 22. *Oportet hereses esse*, Opp. tom. v. *Schl.*]

² [In the *Apostolic Constitutions*, book viii. ch. 32, a three years' preparation

was enjoined; yet with allowance of some exceptions. *Schl.*]

³ This may be placed beyond all controversy by many passages from the fathers of this century. And as it will conduce much to an understanding of the theology of the ancients, which differed in many respects from ours, I will adduce a single passage from Cyprian. It is in his *Epist.* 73, p. 131. *Manifestum est autem, ubi et per quos remissa peccatorum dari possit, quæ in baptismo scilicet datur.*—*Qui vero præpositis ecclesie offeruntur, per nostram orationem et manus impositionem Spiritum sanctum consequuntur.* See also a passage from Dionysius Alex. in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vii. c. 8.

⁴ [Cent. ii. pt. ii. c. iv. § 13. *Tr.*]

⁵ That exorcism was not annexed to baptism, till some time in the third cen-

returned home decorated with a crown and a white robe; the first being indicative of their victory over the world and their lusts, the latter, of their acquired innocence⁶.

§ 5. Greater sanctity and necessity than heretofore, were now attributed to *fasting*; because it was the general belief that demons laid fewer snares for such as lived abstemiously and hardly, than for the full-fed and luxurious⁷. The Latins were singular in keeping every seventh day of the week as a fast⁸; and as the Greek and Oriental Christians would not imitate them in this, it afforded abundant matter for altercation between the two. Ordinarily, Christians *prayed* three times a day, at the third, sixth, and ninth hours⁹, as was the custom of the Jews. Besides these regular hours of prayer, they prayed much and often; for they considered it the highest duty of a holy man to hold converse with God¹. On joyful and festive occasions, when giving thanks to God, they thought it suitable to pray standing, thus expressing their joy and confidence by the posture of their bodies. But on sorrowful occasions and seasons of fasting and humiliation, they were accustomed to make their supplications on their bended knees or prostrate, to indicate self-abasement². That certain *forms of prayer* were every where used, both in public and in private, I have no doubt³; but I am likewise confident that many per-

tury, and after the admission of the Platonic philosophy into the church, may almost be demonstrated. The ceremonies used at baptism, in the second century, are described by Justin Martyr, in his second *Apology*, and by Tertullian, in his book *de Corona militis*. But neither makes any mention of exorcism. This is a cogent argument, to prove that it was admitted by Christians after the times of these fathers, and of course in the third century. Egypt perhaps first received it.

⁶ [Perhaps also of their freedom.—See C. G. Schwarz, *Diss. de ceremoniis et formulis a veterum manumissione ad Baptismum translatis*. Cyprian refers to the white garments; *de Lapsis*, p. 181. *Schl.*]

⁷ *Clementina*, Homil. ix. § 9, p. 688, &c. Porphyry, *de Abstinencia*, lib. iv. p. 417, &c. and others.

⁸ [See *Concilium Eliberitanum*, Canon 26. *Schl.*]

⁹ [9 A. M., 12 noon, and 3 P. M. *Tr.*]

¹ [See Cyprian, *de Oratione*, p. 214. *Schl.*]

² [See Cyprian, *de Oratione*, p. 214; and *Constitut. Apostol.* l. ii. c. 59. *Schl.*]

³ [In the earliest times, exclusive of the short introductory salutation, *Pater noster*, &c., no established forms of prayer were used in public worship, but the bishop or presbyter poured forth extempore prayers. See Justin Martyr, *Apology* ii. The Lord's prayer was used, not only as a pattern, but also as a formula of prayer. Yet only the baptized, and not the catechumens, might utter it. Tertullian, *de Oratione*, c. 1. 9. Cyprian, *de Oratione Domin.* *Constitut. Apostol.* l. vii. c. 44. Afterwards, various forms were gradually introduced, and particularly of short prayers, derived from passages of Scripture. When greater uniformity in the churches as to ceremonies was introduced, the smaller churches had to regulate their forms of prayer conformably to those of

sions poured out the feelings of their hearts before God in free and unpremeditated effusions. They thought the *sign of the cross* very efficacious against all sorts of evils, and particularly against the machinations of evil spirits; and, therefore, no one undertook any thing of much moment, without first crossing himself⁴. Other ceremonies I pass by without notice.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF DIVISIONS AND HERESIES IN THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Remains of the ancient sects.—§ 2. Manes and the Manicheans.—§ 3. His principles.—§ 4. His doctrine concerning man.—§ 5. Concerning the nature of Christ and of the Holy Spirit.—§ 6. Concerning the offices of Christ and the Comforter.—§ 7. Concerning the purification and future condition of souls.—§ 8. Concerning the state of souls not purified.—§ 9. His opinion of the Old and New Testaments.—§ 10. The severity of his moral principles, and the classification of his followers.—§ 11. The sect of the Hieracites.—§ 12. The Noëtian controversy.—§ 13. Sabellius.—§ 14. Beryllus.—§ 15. Paul of Samosata.—§ 16. Disturbances in Arabia.—§ 17. Novatian controversy.—§ 18. Severities of the Novatians towards the lapsed.

§ 1. Most of the sects which disquieted the church in the preceding centuries, caused it various troubles also in this. For the energies of the Montanists, Valentiniens, Marcionites, and other Gnostics, were not wholly subdued by the numerous discussions of their tenets. *Adelphi* and *Aquilinus*, of the Gnostic tribe, but very little known, endeavoured to insinuate

the larger churches, and of course to adopt the formulas of the metropolitan churches. Origen, *contra Celsum*, l. vi.; and *Homilia in Jerem.* Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini Mag.* l. iv. c. 19, 20. 17. *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 17. Lactantius, *de Morte Persecutor.* c. 46, 47. See Baumgarten's *Erläuterung der christlichen Alterthümer*, p. 432. *Schl.*]

⁴ [The Christians at first used the sign of the cross to bring to remembrance the atoning death of Christ, on all occasions. Hence Tertullian, *de Corona militis*, c. 3, p. 121, says: *Ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum*

et exitum, ad restitum, ad calcitratum, ad lacera, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quæcumque nos concursatio exerceat, frontem crucis signaculo terminus. Compare also his work, *ad Uerorem*, lib. ii. So late as the second century, the Christians attached no particular virtue to the sign of the cross, and they paid it no adoration. See Tertullian, *Apologet.* c. 16; and *ad Nationes*, c. 12. But afterwards powerful efficacy began to be ascribed to it. See Cyprian, *Testimonia cæc. Judæos*, l. ii. c. 21, 22, p. 294; and Lactantius, *Institut.* l. iv. c. 27, 28. *Schl.*]

themselves and their doctrines into the esteem of the public at Rome and in Italy¹. But these men, and others of the same kind, were resisted not only by *Plotinus* himself, the chief of the Platonists of this age, but also by his disciples, with all the boldness and energy usual among orthodox believers. The philosophical opinions of this faction concerning God, the origin of the world, the nature of evil, and other subjects, could not, indeed, possibly be approved by Platonists. These united forces of Christians and philosophers were undoubtedly sufficient to deprive the Gnostics gradually of credit and influence with all the well-informed².

§ 2. While the Christians were struggling with these corrupters of the truth, and upon the point of gaining the victory³, a new enemy, more fierce and dangerous than any of them, suddenly appeared upon the field. *Manes*⁴, whom his disciples commonly called also *Manicheus*⁵, a Persian⁶, educated among the Magi, and himself one of their body before he became a Christian, was instructed in all the sciences and arts generally esteemed by the Persians and adjacent nations; he was an astronomer (though a rude one), a physician, painter, and philosopher; but he had an exuberant imagination, and, most probably, a mind beside itself and fanatical. This man

¹ Porphyry, *Vita Plotini*, c. 16, p. 116, &c.

² The book of Plotinus against the Gnostics, is still extant among his works. *Ennead.* ii. lib. ix. p. 213, &c. [Dr. Semler, in his *Historiæ Eccles. Selecta Capita*, vol. i. p. 81, conjectures, and not without reason, that the Gnostics, and all the assailants of the Old Testament, lost their power after Origen introduced the allegorical and tropological mode of expounding Scripture, and extended it in some measure to the history of Christ. And as he further supposes, the labours of Dionysius Alex. and other learned fathers, *e. g.* Dorotheus, a presbyter of Antioch, (who understood the Hebrew; *Encubius*, *H. E.* vii. 32,) may have contributed much to diminish the Gnostic party, as they carried investigation farther, and more lucidly confuted the Jewish notions, and at the same time approximated a little towards the Gnostic doctrines concerning the Son of God. Hence it is, we hear no more about the Gnostics in this century; and the few who still remained,

united themselves with the Manicheans. *Schl.*]

³ [A little past the middle of this century. *Tr.*]

⁴ [The Oriental writers call him Mani; (Hyde, *de Reliq. vet. Persarum*, c. 21, and D'Hérbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, art. *Mani*;) but the Greeks and Latins call him *Māvng*, *Māvng*, and Manes. See Dr. Walch, *Historiæ der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 691. *Schl.*]

⁵ [See the *Acta Archelai*, c. 5. 49. Augustine, *de Hæresib.* c. 46, and *contra Faustum*, lib. xix. c. 22. *Schl.*]

⁶ [Notwithstanding the Greek and Oriental writers represent Manes as being a Persian, Dr. Walch (*Historiæ der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 708.) and Beaussobre (*Historie Critique de Manichéisme*, tome i. p. 66,) think it more probable that he was a Chaldean; because Ephraïm Syrus expressly so states, *Opp. Syro-Latin.* tom. ii. p. 468; and because Archelaus, in his *Acta cum Manicæ*, c. 36, charges Manes with understanding no language but that of the Chaldees. *Schl.*]

adventured to combine the principles of the Magi with Christianity, or rather to explain the latter by the former. To facilitate the accomplishment of this object, he gave out that *Christ* had left the way of salvation imperfectly explained, and that he himself was the *Paraclete* whom the Saviour promised to send to his disciples when he left the world. Many were seduced by his eloquence, his grave aspect, and the simplicity and innocence of his life; and in a short time he established a sect. But at last he was put to death by *Varanes I.*, king of the Persians. The cause, time, and manner of his execution, are variously stated by the ancients⁷.

⁷ All that is extant concerning the life, the deeds, and the doctrines of this very singular genius, has been very carefully collected, and reviewed ingeniously—though often with more ingenuity and copiousness than were necessary—by James de Beausobre, in his *Histoire Critique de Manichéisme et du Manichéisme*, published at Amsterdam, 1734—39, 2 vols. 4to.—[Whoever would gain the best acquaintance with the history of Manes and the Manicheans, may consult, besides Beausobre, *ubi supra*, the long essay of Dr. Mosheim, in his *Comment. de Religi.*, &c. p. 728—903; Jo. Christ. Wolf, *Manichæismus ante Manichæos*, &c. Hamb. 1707, 8vo; Nath. Lardner's *Credibility of the Gospel History*, pt. ii. vol. iii. p. 364—753; and Dr. C. W. F. Walch's *Entwurf einer vollständigen Historie der Ketzerreigen*, vol. i. p. 685—814. These principal writers being consulted, all the rest may be neglected. The last of these works has the great advantage, that it concentrates, arranges properly, criticises acutely and solidly, and expresses in a lucid and agreeable style, all that has been said on the subject by the useful Wolf, the agreeable and learned but prolix Beausobre, the acute Mosheim, and the solid and critical Lardner. *Von Ein.*—The original sources for the history of Manes and his sect according to Mosheim, *Comment. de Religi.*, &c. p. 729, &c. are, besides the ancient historical writers, Epiphanius, Augustine, Eusebius, Theodoret, Damascenus, and Philastrius.—I. What remains of the writings of Manes himself and his followers; viz. (a) *Manis Epistola Fundamenti*, in Augustine, *contra Ep. Fundamenti*; (b) a fragment of his *Sermo de Fide*, in Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxi. 11; (c) his *Epistola*

ad Marcellum, in the *Acta Archelai cum Manete*, p. 6, ed. Zaccag.; (d) some fragments of his *Epistola ad Menoch*, in Augustine, *adv. Julianum Pelagian.*; (e) several extracts from his Epistles, in J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. v. p. 284; (f) *Acta Disputationis Archelai, Episc. Mesopot. cum Manete*, inter *Collectanea Monumentorum veteris Eccles. Græcæ et Latine*, published by L. A. Zaccagnius, Rome, 1698, 4to; also, inter *Opp. Hippolyti*, vol. ii. ed. Fabricii; (the genuineness of these *Acta* is questioned by Beausobre, but without good reason;) (g) many quotations from Faustus the Manichean, in Augustine's 33 books *contra Faustum Manichæum*; (h) various statements of his antagonists, contained in Augustine's 2 books, *de Actis cum Felice Manichæo*; and in his book *contra Fortunatum Manichæum*. II. The writings of the fathers, who attempted to confute Manes and his followers; viz. (a) Augustine, *de Hæresibus*, and in the works above mentioned (l. a, g, and h); (b) Titus of Bostra, lib. iii. *contra Manichæos*, Gr. and Lat. inter *Lectiones Antiquas*, ed. Canisii; et denuo, J. Basnagii, tom. i. p. 156, &c.; (c) Didymus Alexandrinus, *Liber contra Manichæos*, Gr. and Lat. in the same *Lectiones Antiquas*, tom. i. p. 197; (d) Alexander Lycopolitanus, the philosopher, *Liber contra Manichæi opiniones*, Gr. and Lat. in the *Auctarium notiss. Biblioth. Patr.* ed. Combefis, tom. ii. p. 260. *Tr.*—In regard to the history of Manes, there is much disagreement between the Oriental and the Grecian writers. Yet in the particulars stated in the text, there is no disagreement. We will extract from Mosheim's *Commentaries*, p. 734, &c., so much as is necessary to give a full history of this extraordinary man.

§ 3. The religious system of *Manes* is a compound of Christianity and the ancient philosophy of the Persians, which he had imbibed in early life⁸. What the Persians relate concern-

Manes, on meeting with the books of the Christians, found that the religion which they contained, coincided with his philosophy in some respects, and contradicted it in others. He determined to unite the two together, to enlarge and improve the one by the other, and thus to give the world a new religion. He began by giving out that he was the Paraclete, (ὁ Παράκλητος, John xvi. 7. 13, &c.) and perhaps he really supposed himself so. But he was not so deranged and carried away by his imagination, as to be unable to frame a consistent system, and to discover what would tend to confirm it, and what to weaken it. He therefore rejected or altered such books of the Christians as contravened his opinions, and substituted others in their places, particularly those which he pretended were written by himself under a divine impulse. The king of Persia threw him into prison, but for what cause is unknown. The Greek writers (especially Archelaus, in his *Acta cum Manete*, who furnished the other Greek and Latin writers with nearly all the historical facts they state) represent that he was imprisoned, because, having promised to cure the king's son, he failed, and caused the death of the young prince. A different account is given by the oriental writers, (Persian, Syrian, and Arabian, cited by D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orient.* art. *Mani*; Tho. Hyde, *Historia Relig. veter. Persarum*, c. 21; Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor.* p. 42; Edw. Pocock, *Specimen Hist. Arabum*, p. 149, &c.) They state that Manes, coming to the court of king Sapor, was received kindly, and that his doctrines were embraced by the monarch. Hereupon Manes became so bold as publicly to attack the Persian religion. This drew on him persecution, and so endangered his life, that he was obliged to flee into Turkistan. Here he collected many followers, and spent a whole year in a cave, where he composed his book entitled *Erteng*, or *Arzney*, i.e. *the Gospel*, and which is adorned with splendid paintings. This book he represented to be a gift of God. In the mean time Sapor died, and was succeeded by his son Hormisdas, who was so favourable

to Manes, as to embrace his religion, and to allow him to build a castle, in which he might be safe from all plots. Perhaps Hormisdas was a favourer of Manes, in the lifetime of his father. And Dr. Mosheim conjectures, (*Comment.* §c. p. 739,) that the Grecian story of this fatal attempt to cure the king's son, was an oriental *allegory*, which the Greeks construed literally; that the *disease* was ignorance, the *medicine* instruction, the *physician* the teacher, and the *death* of the patient his apostasy from the religion of his progenitors: [all which is very improbable, and indeed inconsistent; for the king, having himself embraced the doctrine of Manes, would not have imprisoned him for converting his son to the same religion.] After the death of Hormisdas, Varanes I. succeeded to the throne. He was at first well disposed towards Manes, but soon turned against him, and determined on his destruction. For this purpose he allured him from his safe retreat, under pretence of a disputation with the Magi, and caused him to be put to death as a perverter of the true religion. This took place in the year 278; or, according to Dr. Walch, (*Hist. der Ketzeren*, vol. i. p. 724,) in the year 277. The shocking fate of Manes rather animated than terrified his followers. The most able and eloquent of them roamed through Syria, Persia, Egypt, Africa, and over most parts of the world; and by the severity of their morals, and the simplicity of their religion, they every where made proselytes. And, notwithstanding all the persecutions that have befallen them, their descendants exist to this day, in the mountains between Persia and India. *Schl.*

⁸ [When Mani appeared, an anxiety prevailed in Persia to re-establish the pure doctrine of Zoroaster; but, from obscurity in documents, it was not found easy to ascertain exactly what that doctrine was. Mani maintained its identity with Christianity, freed from Jewish adulterations. He thus produced a new form of Gnosticism; one chiefly distinguished from its predecessors, by wanting those portions of them which came from Jewish theology and Platonic philosophy. He did not, however, take up

ing their *Mithras*, Manes applied to *Christ*. According to his views and those of the Persians, there are two first principles of all things, a subtile and very pure substance, or *light*, and a gross and corrupt substance, or *darkness*. Over each of these a Lord has reigned from all eternity. The Lord of *light*, is denominated *God*; the regent of the *world of darkness*, is called *Hyle*⁹, or *demon*¹. These two Lords are of opposite natures and dispositions. The Lord of *light*, as he is himself happy, so he is beneficent; the Lord of *darkness*, being himself miserable, wishes others also to be miserable, and is malignant. Each has produced a numerous progeny of his own peculiar character, and distributed them over his empire.

§ 4. For an immense time, the Prince of darkness did not know that light and a land of it existed. But some war that arose in his kingdom brought it under his notice, and he immediately became eager to get possession of it. The Lord of light opposed him with an army; but the general of this celestial army, whose name was *The first Man*, was rather unsuccessful; and the troops of darkness seized a considerable portion, not only of the celestial elements, but also of light itself, which is an animate substance; and these they mixed with depraved matter. Another general from the world of light, called *The living Spirit*, warred more successfully; but could not free the celestial substance from its combination with the vicious elements. The vanquished Prince of darkness produced the parents of the human race. The men who are born of this stock consist of a body formed from the depraved matter of the world of darkness, and of two souls, the one sensitive and concupiscent, which they derived from the Prince of darkness, the other rational and immortal, which is a particle of the divine light plundered by the army of darkness and immersed in matter.

§ 5. Men being thus formed by the Prince of darkness, and

a theory that was undisputed in Persia. The religious authorities of that country were divided as to the origin of all things. Some of them maintained that one Supreme Being had existed from all eternity, from whom, therefore, were derived both *Ormuzd*, the good principle, or lord of light, and *Ahriman*, the bad principle, or lord of darkness. This hypothesis made *Ahriman* to have been originally a good being, but now a fallen

one. Other Persian divines considered *Ormuzd* and *Ahriman* as two self-existent beings, opposed from all eternity to each other. This was the doctrine of the Magusiac sect, to which Mani belonged. He represented, therefore, the opposition between light and darkness as absolute and irreconcilable. See *Rose's Neander*, ii. 140. *Ed.*

⁹ ["Υλη, matter. *Tr.*]

¹ [The devil. *Tr.*]

minds, which were the daughters of eternal light, being inclosed in their bodies, God now, by the *living Spirit*, who had before vanquished the Prince of darkness, formed this our earth out of vicious matter, that it might become the residence of the human race, and might afford God advantages for gradually delivering souls from their bodies, and separating the good matter from the bad. Afterwards God produced from himself two *majestic beings*, who should afford succour to the souls immured in bodies; namely, *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit*. *Christ* is the being whom the Persians call *Mithras*: he is a most splendid substance, consisting of the purest light of God, self-existent, animate, excelling in wisdom, and having his residence in the sun. The *Holy Spirit* likewise is an animate and lucid substance, which is diffused through the whole atmosphere that encompasses our earth, warms and enlightens the souls of men, fecundates the earth, elicits gradually from it the latent particles of divine fire, and wafts them upward, that they may return to their native world.

§ 6. After God had, for a long time, admonished the captive souls immured in bodies, by angels and by men instructed by himself, he at length, in order to accelerate their return to the heavenly country, directed *Christ*, his son, to descend from the sun to this our world. He being clad in the form and shadow of a human body, but not joined to a real body, appeared among the Jews, pointed out the way in which souls may extricate themselves from the body, and proved his divinity² by his miracles. But the Prince of darkness instigated the Jews to crucify him. This punishment, however, he did not endure in reality, from his want of a body, but only in popular apprehension. Having accomplished his embassy, *Christ* returned to his home, the sun, first charging the apostles to propagate the religion that he had taught them throughout the world. Moreover, when departing, he promised to send, at a certain time, a greater and more perfect apostle, whom he called the *Paraclete*, who should make many additions to his precepts, and remove all errors from religious subjects. This *Paraclete*,

² [Not his *Divinity*: for this, in the true and proper sense of the word, the Manichæans could not predicate of Christ, nor of the Holy Ghost. They held neither of them to be more ancient than the world. See Fortunatus, in his

dispute with Augustine, i. p. 69. They believed that the *light* of the *Son* might be obscured by intervening matter, but that the *light* of the *Father* could not. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 775, &c. *Schd.*]

promised by *Christ*, was *Manes* the Persian, who, by command of God, explained the whole doctrine of salvation perfectly, and without reserve of any kind.

§ 7. Such souls as believe *Jesus Christ* to be the Son of God, renounce the worship of the God of the Jews, (who is no other than the Prince of darkness,) obey the laws given by *Christ* but enlarged and explained by *Manes*, the Paraclete, and perseveringly resist the lusts of the evil soul; hence they are purified by degrees from the contaminations of vicious matter. Yet the entire purgation of souls cannot be effected in the present life. Therefore souls, when freed from the body, have still to undergo a twofold purification, after death, before they are admitted into the world of light; first, by sacred *water*, secondly, by sacred *fire*. They first go to the *moon*, which consists of sacred *water*; and in that they are purified during fifteen days; thence they proceed to the *sun*, the holy *fire* of which removes entirely all their remaining pollution. The bodies which they left behind, being formed of base matter, return to their original.

§ 8. But souls which have neglected their purgation, will, after death, pass into new bodies, either of animals or of other beings, until expiation shall be made. Some also, being peculiarly depraved, will be delivered over to the evil demons inhabiting our atmosphere, to be tormented for a season. When the greater part of the souls shall be liberated and restored to the world of light, then, at the command of God, infernal fire will burst from the caverns in which it is contained, and will burn up and destroy the fabric of this world. After these events, the powers of darkness will be compelled to retire to their wretched country, and must remain for ever there. For, lest, by chance, they should make war again upon the territories of light, God will encompass the world of darkness with an invincible guard. This will be composed of souls irrecoverably lost, which will keep watch like soldiers about the world of darkness, so that its miserable inhabitants can go out no more.

§ 9. To give these monstrous opinions some plausibility, *Manes* rejected nearly all the sacred books in which Christians think their religion to be contained. The *Old Testament*, especially, he pronounced to be the work, not of God, but of the Prince of darkness, whom he represented the Jews as wor-

shipping in place of the true God. The four histories of *Christ*, which we call *Gospels*, he either denied to have been composed by the apostles, or he maintained that if they were so, they had been corrupted, interpolated, and stuffed with Jewish fables by crafty and deceitful men. In place of them he substituted another Gospel which he denominated *Erteng*, and which he affirmed had been dictated to him by God himself³. The *Acts of the Apostles* he wholly rejected. The *Epistles* which are ascribed to *St. Paul*, he admitted to have been written by him, but maintained that they were adulterated. What he thought of the other books of the New Testament, we are not informed.

§ 10. The rules of life which *Manes* prescribed for his followers, were peculiarly rigorous and severe. For he directed them to mortify and macerate the body, which he regarded as the very essence of evil, and the work of the Prince of darkness; to deprive it of every convenience and gratification, to extirpate every sensual appetite, and to divest themselves of all the propensities and instincts of nature. But as he foresaw that he could expect few to embrace his system, if he imposed upon all, without discrimination, such severe rules of life, he divided his followers into two classes, the *elect* and the *hearers*; that is, the *perfect* Christians and the *imperfect*⁴. The former, or the *elect*, were to abstain from flesh, eggs, milk, fish, wine, and every inebriating drink, from marriage, and from every indulgence of sexual passions, to live in the most abject poverty, to sustain their emaciated bodies with bread, herbs, pulse, and melons, to abstain from all active life, and to be devoid both of love and hatred. A milder rule was prescribed for the *hearers*. They might possess houses, lands, and goods, eat flesh, though sparingly, and marry wives: yet even these

³ ["He remained for a time in the province of Turkistan, and prepared there a series of beautiful pictures, which contained a symbolical representation of his doctrine,—the book which was named by the Persians, *Ertengi—Mani*. It may probably have happened that he withdrew into solitude, in order to receive the revelations of God, as he declared that he derived these images (which represented his conceptions) amidst calm reflection, in a cavern, and maintained that he re-

ceived them in his mind from heaven." Rose's *Neander*, ii. 146. *Ed.*]

⁴ [The *elect* were also called the *faithful*, or *believers*; and the *hearers* were called *catechumens*. The former were either baptized or unbaptized. If baptized, they could not change their condition; if unbaptized, they might return to the class of *hearers*, if they found themselves unable to endure the rigorous discipline of the perfect. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* &c. p. 896, &c. *Schl.*]

indulgences had their limitations. The whole body of Manichæans were subjected to one president, who represented *Jesus Christ*; with him were connected twelve *masters*, or rulers, who represented the twelve apostles; next to these there were seventy-two *bishops*, corresponding with the seventy-two disciples of Christ; and under each bishop there were *presbyters* and *deacons*. All these officers were from the class of the *elect*⁵.

§ 11. The sect of the *Hieracites* was formed in Egypt, near the close of this century, by *Hierax*⁶ of Leontopolis, a transcriber of books by profession⁷, but a man of learning, and venerable for conspicuous sanctity of deportment. Many have supposed that this sect was a branch of the Manichæan family, but erroneously; for although *Hierax* held some notions in common with *Manes*, yet he differed from him in many respects. He believed *Christ's* great business to have been the promulgation of a *new law*, more perfect and severe than that of *Moses*. Hence he made him to have restrained his followers from marriage, flesh, wine, and all things grateful to the senses and the body: so that indulgences which *Moses* gave, were taken away by *Jesus*. Yet if we duly consider all accounts, it will

⁵ All these particulars are more fully stated, and supported by citations from antiquity, in my *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* &c. [p. 728—903; with which the reader should compare Dr. Walch's *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 685—814. From both, we extract the following notices, respecting the worship of this sect. They revered the sun and the moon, though they did not account them deities. Their worship was so simple, that they claimed to be farther removed from paganism than all other Christians. They had no temples, no altars, no images, no oblations, and no burning of incense. They observed Sundays, which they kept as fasts. But they observed none of the Christian festivals which relate to the incarnation and baptism of Christ. They celebrated the memorial of Christ's death but with little of devotion. Whether they observed Easter, is uncertain. But they observed the anniversary of *Manes'* death, which they called *Bama*, with great devotion. *Fasting* was one of their most important religious exercises. They kept sacred Sundays and Mondays. They made use of *baptism*; but did not bap-

tize either children, or grown persons who were only *hearers*; and even to the *elect*, it was left optional, whether they would be baptized or not. The *elect* observed likewise the *Lord's Supper*; though it is not known what they used in place of wine, which was with them altogether prohibited. *Schl.*—The *elect* were, therefore, in a manner, "the Brahmins of the Manichees;" and *Faustus*, as quoted by *Augustine*, calls them *sacerdotale genus*. Like, also, the Brahminical devotees of India, they were not to wound or kill any animal. They were "not even to pull any vegetable, nor to pluck any fruit or flower." *Rose's Neander*, ii. 165. *Ed.*]

⁶ [Otherwise called *Hieracas*. *Ed.*]

⁷ ["According to the practice of ascetics, he procured for himself what was necessary for his livelihood, and means for the exercise of his benevolence, by an art which was much-prized, and much used in Egypt, that of *fine penmanship*, in which he was skilful, both as regarded the Greek and the Coptic characters." *Rose's Neander*, ii. 404. *Ed.*]

seem that *Hierax*, like *Manes*, did not consider these hard injunctions as imposed by Christ on *all*, but only on such as aimed at virtue of the higher kind. To this radical error he added others, either growing out of it, or derived elsewhere. For example, he excluded infants, who died before they came to the use of reason, from the kingdom of heaven; because divine rewards could be due to none but such as had actually passed through regular conflicts with the body and its lusts. He also maintained, that *Melchisedec*, the king of Salem who blessed Abraham, was the *Holy Spirit*. The resurrection of the body he denied: and the whole sacred volume, and especially its historical parts, he obscured with allegorical interpretations⁸.

§ 12. The controversies respecting the divine *Trinity*, which commenced in the preceding century, from the time when Grecian philosophy got into the church, had a wider spread in this century, and produced various methods of explaining that doctrine. First⁹, *Noëtus*, a man of whom little is known, a native of Smyrna, maintained that *God* himself, whom he denominated the *Father*, and held to be absolutely *one and indivisible*, united himself with the man *Christ*, whom he called the *Son*; and, in him, was born and suffered. From this dogma of *Noëtus*, his adherents were called *Patripassians*; i. e. persons who held that the great *Parent* of the universe himself, and not merely some *one person* of the Godhead, had made expiation for the sins of men. Nor were they unfitly denominated so, if the ancients correctly understood their views¹.

⁸ Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxvii. [and Augustine, *Hæresib.* c. 47,] from whom nearly all others have borrowed, with little exception, all they state. [See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christianor.* §c. p. 903—910. Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 815—823. Tillamont, *Mém. pour servir à l'Hist. Ecclési.* tom. iv. p. 411; and Lardner's *Credibility of the Gospel Hist.* pt. ii. vol. vi. p. 76, &c. *Schl.*]

⁹ [In the early part of the century. *Tr.*]

¹ See Hippolytus, *Sermo contra Hæresin Noëti*, in his *Opp.* tom. ii. p. 5, ed. Fabricii; Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxvii. *Opp.* tom. i. p. 479; Theodoret, *Hæres. Flabul.* l. iii. c. 3. *Opp.* tom. iv. p. 227.—[*Noëtus* so held the *unity* of God, as to discard the orthodox opinion of a plu-

rality of persons in the Godhead. In fact he acknowledged but *one person*; who is designated in the Scriptures by the title of the *Father*. *Noëtus* therefore was a Unitarian, as respects the doctrine of *three persons*; but in regard to the character of Christ, he held better views than the Socinians. So far as relates to two natures united in one person in Christ, he agreed with the orthodox; but the divine person, which was united with the human nature, according to *Noëtus*' views, was no other than the person of the Father, because there was no other person in the Godhead. See Mosheim, *de Rebus Christianor.* p. 681—687; and Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii. p. 1—13. *Schl.*]

§ 13. Like opinions, when half the century had passed, were maintained by *Sabellius*, either an African presbyter or bishop, at Ptolemais, the principal city in Pentapolis, a province of Libya Cyrenaica. He explained what the Scriptures teach concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in a manner somewhat different from *Noëtus*; and found followers, although he was confuted by *Dionysius* of Alexandria. *Noëtus* had supposed, that God the Father *personally* assumed the human nature of Christ; but *Sabellius* held that only a certain *energy*, put forth by the supreme Parent, or a certain *portion* of the divine nature being separated from it, became united with the *Son*, or the man *Christ*. The *Holy Spirit* he considered as a similar portion or part of the eternal Father². Hence it appears, that

² Most of the ancients who wrote against the heretics, speak of *Sabellius*; [especially Epiphanius, *Har.* xii.; and Theodoret, *Haer. Fabul.* l. ii. c. 9.] To these, add Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vi. c. 6. Athanasius, *de Sententiâ Dionysii*; [and Basil the Great, *Ep.* 210, and 235.] Nearly all that is written by the ancients has been collected by Christopher Wormius, in his *Historia Sabelliana*, Francf. and Lips. 1696; 8vo, a learned work, only a small part of which relates to *Sabellius*.—[See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* §c. p. 683—699. (J. Beausobre, *Histoire de Manichéisme*, §c. tome i. p. 533; &c. N. Lardner, *Credibility of the Gosp. Hist.* pt. ii. vol. iv. p. 556, &c.) and Dr. Walsh, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. ii. p. 14—49.—The last of these differs somewhat from Dr. Mosheim, in his description of the Sabellian doctrine. We would place the two accounts side by side, without attempting to decide so difficult a question. The most common opinion respecting the Sabellian doctrine, was this: *Sabellius* admitted but *one person* in the Divine essence; or he denied that the Father was one person, the Son another person, and the Holy Spirit a third; of course he discarded the inherent distinction of three persons. He admitted a difference only of names, and of some external relations to creatures, in regard to the government of the world and of the church; and he ascribed to the Son those works which we regard as the personal acts of the Father; and on the other hand, he ascribed to the Father the acts and the sufferings of the Son. Now Dr. Mosheim concedes,

that *Sabellius* taught there was but *one divine person*; but he maintains also, that *Sabellius* admitted a *Trinity*, and a real difference between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; though this difference was neither an essential, nor a personal one; the divine *three* were not three distinct persons, but three portions of the divine nature, all depending on God, and at the same time differing from God, and from each other. That portion, by which God made the world, is the Father; and is also the Father of Christ, inasmuch as it formed Him in the womb of Mary. That portion, which united itself with the man of Christ, in order to redeem men, is the Son; inasmuch as it dwelt in the Son of God, (a designation which refers to his miraculous conception,) and by him gave instruction, wrought miracles, and, in a sense, made one person with him. The third portion of the divine nature, which imparts life to all living beings, enlightens men, regenerates them, and prompts them to what is good, is the Holy Ghost. These three are, in one view, separate from God; but in another, they are united with Him. After a critical examination of the correctness of this scheme, Dr. Walsh cannot fully accord with the views of chancellor Mosheim. He therefore states the doctrine of *Sabellius* thus: the ancients, one and all, say, that the Sabellian system marred the true doctrine concerning God, and concerning all the three persons. And so it appears to be proved, by the ancients, that Sabellianism was one of two directly opposite errors, of which Arianism was the other; and that the

the *Sabellians* must have been denominated by the ancients *Patripassians*, in a different sense of the word from that in

true doctrine occupied the middle ground between them: indeed Arius, by pushing his opposition to Sabellius too far, was led into his error. It hence follows, that Sabellius, who did not deny the existence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, made too little distinction between them; while Arius made the distinction too wide. It is clear, that Sabellius acknowledged but *one person*, and considered the Son of God as not being a *distinct person*: so that he could not have taught a *personal* distinction in the Trinity. By the Word (Λόγος), Sabellius understood an *energy*, by which the man Christ performed his works. So long as Christ remained on earth, this divine energy was in him; but afterwards it ceased. It was therefore like a sunbeam, which operates on bodies and produces the effects of the sun, without being itself a person. So also is it with the Holy Ghost, by which we are to understand the *operations* of God in men, tending to further their knowledge of the truth and their advancement in virtue. The manner of God's *putting forth his energy*, by which the Son was produced, and by which the Holy Ghost is still produced and continued, the ancients expressed by the words, to *spread out*, or *extend* (πλάτύνεσθαι, protendere, extendere), to *send forth* (πέμπεσθαι), and to *transform*, or *change one's form* and *appearance* (μεταμορφιῆσθαι, μετασχηματίζεω). From what has now been stated, it may be perceived how Sabellius could have taught the existence of three *forms* or *aspects* (τρία πρόσωπα) in the divine essence, without admitting the reality of three different *persons*; and how his opposers could infer, that he admitted but *one distinction* under three different *names*. The greatest difficulty is in this, that according to some representations, Sabellius taught there was a *difference* or *separation* (διαίρεσις) between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but according to other accounts, he maintained such a *unity* as was inconsistent with it. This difficulty is the most easily surmounted, by supposing the former to refer to an imagined or conceived distinction, and not any real one. Such are Dr. Walch's views of the Sabellian system; [and

very similar are those of Dr. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 1018—1025. *Tr.* — Dr. Walch thinks that Sabellius ought not to be called a *Patripassian*; for, these held Christ to be *one person*, in whom *two natures* were personally united; and believed that, not the divine nature of the Son, as a person, but the divine nature of the Father, who was the only person, was united with the human nature in Christ. Now as Sabellius held the Son to be no real *part* of the Father, and still less held to a *personal* union of two natures in Christ, he cannot truly be called a *Patripassian*. According to Sabellius' opinion, Christ was a *mere man*, in whom resided a *divine power*, that produced those effects which we regard as the acts of the divine nature united to the human. Among the opposers of Sabellius, Dionysius of Alexandria attracted the most notice. Yet the opposition made by this bishop was not satisfactory to all. Offensive passages were found in his epistles against the Sabellians. As he there brought forward the doctrine of Christ's *incarnation*, and from that deduced his proof of the real distinction between the Father and the Son; he was understood as holding that the Son, in so far as he was a divine being, was a *created one*, or as denying that the Father and the Son were of the same essence. Dionysius defended himself, and showed that he had been misunderstood. Notwithstanding this, the Arians, after his death, claimed him as on their side, which obliged Athanasius to vindicate the reputation of Dionysius against them. Still there continued to be some to whom this defence appeared insufficient; Basil the Great is an example. There can be no doubt that Dionysius *thought* with Athanasius in regard to the *Trinity*, but he used the *language* of Arius. In regard to the *person of Christ*, he expressed himself in the manner of Nestorius; for he carried the distinction between the divine and the human natures of Christ so far, as wholly to exclude the former from a participation in those changes in the latter which were the result of the personal union of the two natures. See Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii. p. 50—63. *Schd.*]

which the *Noëlians* were so called. Yet the appellation was not wholly improper.

§ 14. Nearly at the same time³, *Beryllus*, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, a pious and learned man, taught that *Christ*, before his birth of the virgin, had no distinct divinity, but only that of the *Father*. This proposition, if we duly consider what is reported concerning him by the ancients, amounts to this, that *Christ* had no existence before he was born of Mary; that at his birth, a *soul*, which originated from God himself, and was a particle of the divine nature, and therefore superior to the souls of all men, entered and was united with the man. *Beryllus* was so lucidly and energetically confuted by *Origen*, in a council assembled at Bostra⁴, that he gave up the cause, and returned into the bosom of the church⁵.

§ 15. Very different from him, both in morals and in sentiment, was *Paul* of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, and at the same time clothed with the civil office of a *ducenarius*⁶. He was a man fickle, wealthy, and arrogant⁷, whose novel explanation of

³ [About A. D. 244. *Tr.*]

⁴ [A. D. 244. *Tr.*]

⁵ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. c. 20 and 33. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 60. Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iii. c. 7. Among the moderns, see Jo. Le Clerc, *Ars Critica*, vol. i. pt. ii. sec. i. c. 14. Chaufepié, *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Crit.* tome i. p. 268, &c. [See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* &c. p. 639, &c. and Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. ii. p. 126—136.—Dr. Walch does not place *Beryllus* among the heretics; because he is not chargeable with obstinacy in his errors, nor with establishing a sect or party; both of which are necessary to constitute a heretic. Concerning his sentiments, little is known, except that he maintained that *Christ*, before his incarnation, did not exist as a divine person; but that after his incarnation, he was a man in whom God, namely the *Father*, dwelt.—Dr. Mosheim's assertion, that *Beryllus* represented *Christ* as possessing a *soul* derived from the divine essence, is a mere conjecture that cannot be supported by proof. *Schl.*—Dr. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. pt. ii. p. 1014, &c. places *Beryllus* among that class of *Patristians*, who considered the personality of the Son of God as originating from a *radiation* or *emanation* from the essence of God into a human body. He therefore

places *Beryllus* and *Sabellius* in the same class. *Tr.*]

⁶ [The *ducenarii* were a species of procurators for the emperors, in the provinces, whose salary was two hundred sesteritia, [*ducenta sesteritia*, equal to 161*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.* Ed.] from which sum, these officers derived their title. See *Dion Cassius*, lib. liii. Suetonius, *Claudius*, c. 24, and Salsmasius, *Notes on Capitolinus*, *Pertinax*, p. 125. From Sellar's *Antiquities of Palmyra*, Lond. 1696, 8vo, p. 166, &c. it appears, that this office was much used in the province of Syria, and Dr. Mosheim conjectures, (*Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 705,) that *Paul* obtained it by means of *Zenobia*, who had a high esteem for him. *Schl.*]

⁷ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vii. c. 30. [Eusebius here gives copious extracts from the circular letter of the council, which condemned *Paul*, and ordained *Domnus* his successor. The council characterize *Paul*, as having risen from poverty to opulence, by extortion and bribery; as proud and insolent and ostentatious; as choosing to be addressed by his civil title, and appearing in public attended by guards and all the splendour of worldly rank; as affecting splendour and power, and abusing authority as an officer in the church; as intolerably vain, and coveting the adulations of the multitude; as deriding the fathers of

the doctrine upon the divine nature and *Christ*, greatly disquieted the eastern church, soon after the middle of this century. The sect which embraced his opinions, were called *Paulians*, or *Paulianists*. So far as can be judged from the accounts that have reached us, he supposed the Son and the Holy Spirit to exist in God, just as reason and the operative power do in man; that *Christ* was born a mere man; but that the *wisdom* or *reason* of the Father descended into him and enabled him to teach and to work miracles; that on account of this union of the divine Word⁸ with the man *Christ*, we might say that *Christ* was *God*, though not in the proper sense of the term. He so concealed his real sentiments under ambiguous forms of speech, that repeated ecclesiastical councils were wholly unable to convict him: but at last, in a council assembled A.D. 269, *Malchion*, a rhetorician, drew him from his evasions. On this exposure, he was divested of his episcopal office¹.

§ 16. In a very different way, some minute philosophers in Arabia, disciples of a man unknown, marred a part of the

the church, exalting himself, and abolishing the hymns in common use, and appointing women to sing psalms in praise of himself; as sending out bishops and presbyters to sound his praise, and to extol him as an angel from heaven; as keeping several young and handsome women near his person, whom he enriched with presents, and as living in luxury with them.—How much of colouring there may be in this picture, we have not the means of determining. But there can be little doubt, that the character of Paul was such as did not become a bishop. *Tr.*

⁸ [*Λόγος. Tr.*]

⁹ [*Λόγος. Tr.*]

¹ See *Epistola Concilii Antiocheni ad Paulum*, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, tom. xi. p. 302, ed. Paris, 1644, fol. and *Dionysii Alexandrini Ep. ad Paulum*, *ibid.* p. 273, and *Decem Pauli Samosatensis Questiones*, *ibid.* p. 278.—[See also Dr. Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* §e. p. 701—718, and Dr. Walsh, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. ii. p. 64—125. From the last writer, we extract the following, to give a more full and correct view of the Samosatene doctrines. 1. Paul of Samosata taught, that there is but *one* God, who in the Scriptures is denominated *the Father*. 2. He did not deny, that the Scriptures

speak of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. 3. What he understood by the Holy Ghost, we do not know; and Dr. Mosheim has attempted to supply this defect, by a mere conjecture. 4. Concerning the *Word* and the *Wisdom* of God, he has spoken largely: but whether he distinguished between the *Word in God* (*Λόγος ἐνδιδάκτορος*) and the *Word produced from God* (*Λόγος προφορικός*), is doubtful. 5. This *Word* or *Wisdom* in God, is not a substance or a person. 6. But it is in the divine mind, as reason is in men. 7. Christ was a *mere man*. 8. He first began to exist, when he was born of Mary. 9. Yet in this man dwelt the divine *Word* or *Wisdom*; and it was operative in Him. 10. The union commenced, when Christ was conceived in the womb of Mary. 11. By means of this *Wisdom* of God in Him, Christ gradually acquired his knowledge and his practical virtues. By it, he became at once *God* and the *Son of God*; yet both, in an improper sense of the terms. —From this account it appears, that Photian, in the next age, came very near to Paul of Samosata, not indeed in his statements and expressions, but rather in his grand error, namely, that Christ was a mere man, and superior to other men only on account of his pre-eminent gifts. *Schl.*]

Christian system. They denied the soul to be *immortal*; maintaining that it died with the body, and that it would be resuscitated with it by the power of God². The believers in this doctrine were called *Arabians*, from the country in which they lived. Against them *Origen*, being sent for from Egypt, disputed with such success in a full council, that they renounced their error.

§ 17. Among the sects which arose in this century, I shall place the *Novatians* last. They did not, indeed, corrupt religion itself, but by the severity of the discipline to which they adhered, a lamentable schism was produced. *Novatian*³, a presbyter in the church of Rome, a man of learning and eloquence, but stern and austere⁴, maintained that such as had fallen into the more heinous sins, and especially such as had denied *Christ* during the Decian persecution, ought never to be received again into the church. Most of the other presbyters, as well as *Cornelius*, whose influence was very great, were of a different opinion. Hence, in the year 250, when a new bishop was to be chosen at Rome, in place of *Fabian*, *Novatian* strenuously opposed the election of *Cornelius*. He was nevertheless chosen, and *Novatian* withdrew from communion with him. On the other hand, *Cornelius*, in a council holden at Rome, A.D. 251, excommunicated *Novatian* and his adherents. *Novatian*, therefore, founded a new sect, in which he was the first bishop. This sect had many adherents, who were pleased with the severity of its discipline; and it continued to flourish in many parts of Christendom until the *fifth* century. The principal coadjutor of *Novatian* in this schism was *Novatus*, a presbyter of Carthage, who fled to Rome during the heat of this controversy, in order

² Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vi. c. 37. [See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* &c. p. 718, and Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii. p. 167—171. —As Eusebius, who is the only witness we have in regard to this sect, gives a very brief account of them, the learned in modern times have entertained two opinions concerning their system. Some suppose, that they held that the soul, though immaterial, *sleeps* while the body is in the grave; which, however, the words of Eusebius seem to contradict, for they describe the soul as *dying*, and *being dissolved, with the body*, συναποθνήσκειν τοῖς σώματι καὶ συνδιαφθείρεσθαι. Others suppose, more correctly, that

they were Christian *materialists*, who regarded the soul as being a *part of the body*. And Dr. Mosheim conjectures, that their error originated from their combining the Epicurean philosophy with Christianity. *Schl.*]

³ [The Greeks always write his name Novatus or Navatus: but the Latins generally write it Novatianus; perhaps, to distinguish him from Novatus of Carthage, the names being really the same. *Tr.*]

⁴ [These traits of character he perhaps owed to the Stoic philosophy, to which some have supposed him addicted. See Walch, l. c. p. 195. *Schl.*]

to escape the anger and condemnation of *Cyprian* his bishop, with whom he had a violent quarrel⁵.

⁵ [Dr. Waleh, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. ii. p. 220, &c. after surveying the original accounts, gives the following connected view of these events. A great number of those who, in the Decian persecution, had fallen from their steadfastness, having afterwards repented of their fall, and sought to be admitted again to the communion of the Church, gave rise to the question of conscience, how they ought to be treated. The episcopal chair at Rome was at that time vacant, in consequence of the death of Fabian; and the clergy were divided in regard to this question, some advocating mild, and others more rigorous measures. Among the latter was Novatian, among the former Cornelius; both of them elders in the Church of Rome. On the side of Novatian were several confessors; that is, persons who had endured various corporeal punishments during the persecution, without denying the faith; and these were haughty and overbearing towards their fallen brethren. While this subject was in agitation at Rome, news came from Carthage, that the lapsed there would be received again, but only after enduring a long penance; though, if in imminent danger of death, and they desired it, they might be reunited to the church. And these principles were approved at Rome, in an epistle composed by Novatian (inter. *Epistolas Cypri.* ep. 31). Now came on the election of a bishop of Rome; and here the two parties were divided. Novatian solemnly declared, that he did not desire the office; and Cornelius was chosen by a majority of the votes. But as Cornelius was one of the milder party, not only Novatian, but also the confessors, and several of the elders, were dissatisfied with his election; and, it would seem, separated themselves from him. About this time Novatus arrived from Carthage. He had fallen out with Cyprian his bishop, and perhaps knew that Cyprian was a friend of Cornelius; but the former did not commit himself. Cornelius acquainted Cyprian with his election. Information had already reached Carthage, that Cornelius was not approved by all at Rome; and Cyprian did not venture at once to declare in his favour, but sent two African bishops, Caldonius and Fortunatus, to Rome, with a letter addressed not to

Cornelius, as bishop, but to the clergy there, and to the neighbouring bishops who were present at the election. The Cornelian party again stated, that his election was regular; and the African envoys, with two envoys from Rome who accompanied them home, affirmed the same thing. Hereupon Cornelius was recognised at Carthage as being the bishop of Rome. But at Rome the business was not so easily settled. The dissatisfied party urged a new election; and Novatus and Evaristus were the most suitable persons to persuade Novatian to consent to receive ordination. As at least three bishops must impose hands on a bishop elect, three such clergymen were drawn from some small towns in Italy, and by deception induced to perform this act. The ordination was also performed at an unusual hour. Novatian appears to have reluctantly consented to it; but he afterwards endeavoured to support himself in office. He sent letters every where, and twice despatched envoys to Africa. These could get no hearing from Cyprian and his adherents; yet their mission was not without effect. In other countries, likewise, he found persons who considered his dissatisfaction with Cornelius, and with his conduct towards the lapsed, as being well founded. In the mean time Cornelius held a council at Rome, which approved of the milder principles of discipline. Novatian was present, and resisted those principles before the council; but he was excommunicated by it, together with his adherents. This caused his party to diminish, many of his friends choosing rather to be on the stronger side; and hence he was induced, when administering the sacrament of the supper to his followers, to make them promise not to forsake him. *Schld.*—As the dissensions at Carthage about the same time had some connexion with those at Rome, and also tend to show the state of the church in the middle of this century, the following account of them is extracted from Mosheim's *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. § xiii. p. 497, &c. and § xiv. p. 503, &c. Novatus, a presbyter at Carthage, even before the Decian persecution, had disagreed with Cyprian his bishop, and formed a party who were dissatisfied with him, and who would not yield to all his wishes. Ac-

§ 18. Respecting the fundamental articles of the Christian faith, there was no disagreement between the *Novatians* and other Christians. Their peculiarity was, that they would not receive into the church persons who, after being baptized, fell into the greater sins. They did not, however, exclude them from all hopes of eternal salvation. They considered the Christian church, therefore, as a society of innocent persons, who, from their entrance into it, had defiled themselves with no sin of any considerable magnitude; and hence it followed, that all associations of Christians which opened the door for the return of gross offenders, were in their view unworthy of the name of true churches. And hence they assumed the appellation of *Cathari*, that is, the *pure*; and what was still more, they re-baptized such as came over to them from the Catholics. For such influence had the error which they embraced upon their own minds, that they believed the baptism of churches admitting the lapsed, quite impotent for conveying remission of sins⁶.

cording to the representations of his adversaries, Novatus was not only arrogant, factious, vain, and rash, but also chargeable with many offences and crimes. Cyprian therefore resolved to bring him to trial, and to excommunicate him. The day for trial was appointed; but the imperial edict [for the persecution] unexpectedly intervened; and as Cyprian was obliged to retire into concealment, Novatus continued safe in his office. This was the first act in the long tragedy. While Cyprian was in retirement, and the African magistrates fiercely persecuting the Christians, these contests were suspended. But when the violence of the storm from without was past, and Cyprian was preparing to return to his church, Novatus, fearing no doubt that the bishop would renew the prosecution against him, which was commenced before his retirement, deemed it necessary to raise a party against the bishop, which would prevent his returning to his church, and thus deprive him of the power of doing him harm. By means of Felicissimus, therefore, whom he had made his deacon, contrary to the will of the bishop, Novatus alienated a part of the church from Cyprian. Felicissimus, aided by one Augendus, prevented the execution of the plans of the bishop in regard to the poor. Many of the people came over to his party; and also five presbyters, who had long been at variance with Cyprian.

This turbulent party were able to retard a little, but not to prevent the return of Cyprian. After some delay, which prudence dictated, the bishop returned to Carthage; and having assembled a council on the subject, especially of the lapsed, he punished the temerity of his adversaries, and excommunicated Felicissimus, the author of the revolt, together with the five presbyters his associates. Novatus was not of the number, as he was absent, having fled to Rome as soon as he found Cyprian would come to Carthage. The excommunicated persons, despising the censure passed on them, instituted a new church at Carthage, in opposition to that of Cyprian, and established as the bishop of it Fortunatus, one of the presbyters whom Cyprian had condemned. But the party had more resolution than ability, and the schism was probably extinguished not long after its birth; for no mention is made of its progress by any of the fathers. *Tr.*]

⁶ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vi. c. 43. Cyprian, in various of his Epistles, as *Ep.* 49, 52, &c. Gabr. Albaspinus, *Observat. Eccles.* lib. ii. c. 20, 21. Jos. Aug. Orsi, *de Criminum Capital. inter ceteros Christ. Absolutione*, p. 254, &c. Steph. Kenckel, *de Hæresi Novatiana*, Argentor. 1651, 4to. [also, Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* &c. p. 512—537, and Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. ii. p. 185—288. *Schl.*]

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
UNDER THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK II.
EMBRACING
EVENTS FROM CONSTANTINE THE GREAT
TO
CHARLEMAGNE.

CENTURY FOURTH.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS AND THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Peaceful state of Christians at the beginning of the century.—§ 2. Persecution of Diocletian.—§ 3. The causes and the severity of it.—§ 4. The Christian cause reduced to great extremities.—§ 5. Tranquillity restored on the accession of Constantine to supreme power.—§ 6. Defeat of Maxentius.—§ 7, 8. Different opinions concerning the faith of Constantine.—§ 9. The cross seen by him in the heavens.—§ 10. Persecution of Licinius.—§ 11. State of the church under the sons of Constantine the Great.—§ 12. Julian persecutes the Christians.—§ 13. His character.—§ 14. The Jews attempt to rebuild their temple in vain.—§ 15. State of the church after the death of Julian.—§ 16. Remains of the pagans.—§ 17. Efforts of the philosophers against Christianity.—§ 18. Injuries it received from them.—§ 19. Propagation of Christianity among the Armenians.—§ 20. The Abyssinians and Georgians.—§ 21. The Goths.—§ 22. The Gauls.—§ 23. The causes of so many revolutions.—§ 24. Severe persecutions in Persia.

§ 1. THAT I may not place asunder needlessly facts intimately connected with each other, I have determined to exhibit whatever of good or ill befel the Christians in this century, not separately, as heretofore, but conjointly, following as much as possible the order of time. When the century began, the Roman empire had four sovereigns; of whom two were superior to the others, and bore the title of *Augustus*; namely, *Diocletian*, and

Maximianus Hercules: the two inferior sovereigns, who bore the title of *Cæsars*, were *Constantius Chlorus*, and *Galerius Maximianus*. Under these four [associated] emperors, the face of Christian affairs was tolerably happy¹. *Diocletian*, though superstitious, indulged no hatred towards the Christians². *Constantius Chlorus*, following only the dictates of reason in matters of religion, was averse from the popular idolatry, and friendly to the Christians³. The pagan priests, therefore, from well-grounded fears, lest Christianity, to their great and lasting injury, should spread its triumphs far and wide, endeavoured to excite *Diocletian*, whom they knew to be both timid and credulous, by means of feigned oracles and other impositions, to make war upon the Christians⁴.

§ 2. These artifices not succeeding very well, they made use of the other emperor, *Galerius Maximianus*, who was also son-in-law of *Diocletian*, to effect their purpose. This cruel man, who knew nothing but military matters, was impelled partly by natural inclination, partly by his mother, a most superstitious woman, and partly by the pagan priests, to work incessantly upon his father-in-law, till he obtained an edict from him at Nicomedia, in the year 303, by which the temples of the Christians were to be demolished, their sacred books committed to

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. viii. c. 1. [Eusebius here describes the prosperous state of the Christians, and their consequent security and vices. The imperial palaces were full of Christians, and no one hindered them from openly professing Christianity. From among them men were chosen to the offices of imperial councillors, provincial governors, magistrates, and generals. The bishops and other clergy were held in honour, even by those who adhered to the old religion of the state. And the number of Christians was seen to be increasing daily. Hence in all the cities spacious buildings were erected for public worship, in which the people assembled without fear: and they had nothing to wish for, unless it were that one or more of the emperors might embrace their religion. *Schl.*]

² [He had Christians in his court, who understood how to lead him, and who would probably have brought him to renounce idolatry, had not the suggestions of their enemies prevailed with him. His wife Prisca was, in reality, a concealed Christian; and also his

daughter Valeria, the wife of *Galerius Maximianus*. See *Lactantius, de Mortibus Persecutorum*, c. 15. *Schl.*]

[³ Some go still farther, and make him to have been actually a Christian. But from the representations of Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. viii. c. 13, no more can be inferred, than that he was disposed to look favourably upon the Christian religion. *Schl.*]

⁴ Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, lib. ii. c. 50. *Lactantius, Institut. Divinar.* lib. iv. c. 27, and *de Mortibus Persecutor.* c. 10. [According to Eusebius, l. c., it was reported to the emperor, that the oracle of Apollo had declared, he was prevented from giving true responses by the righteous men on the earth; and this the pagan priests interpreted, when questioned by the emperor, with reference to the Christians. According to *Lactantius, ubi supra*, while *Diocletian* was at Antioch, in the year 302, the priests who inspected the entrails of the consecrated victims, declared, that they were interrupted in their prognostications by the sign of the cross made by several of the emperor's servants. *Schl.*]

the flames, and themselves deprived of all civil rights and honours⁵. This *first* edict spared the lives of the Christians; for *Diocletian* was averse from slaughter and bloodshed. Yet it caused many Christians to be put to death, particularly those who refused to deliver up their sacred books to the magistrates⁶. Seeing this, many Christians, among whom were even bishops and priests, in order to save life, gave up the books and sacred things in their possession. These were, however, charged with sacrilege by others of greater constancy, and branded with the ignominious name of *Traditors*⁷.

§ 3. Not long after the publication of this first edict, two conflagrations broke out in the palace of Nicomedia; which their enemies persuaded *Diocletian* to believe were kindled by Christians. Hence he ordered many of them in that city to be tortured, and punished as incendiaries⁸. Nearly at the same

⁵ Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 11. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. viii. c. 2. [This persecution should, properly, be named that of Galerius Maximianus, and not that of Diocletian. For Diocletian had much the least hand in it; and he resigned his authority before the persecution had continued quite two years; moreover, Maximianus, in his edict for putting an end to the persecution, a little before his death acknowledges that he himself was the author of it. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* viii. 17, and Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 34. Romulia, the mother of Galerius, who was a very superstitious and haughty woman, and who was offended that the Christians would not allow her to be present when they celebrated the Lord's supper, contributed to inflame the rage of her son against them. Perhaps also the Platonic philosophers had some influence in exciting the emperor's hostility; for they represented the many sects among the Christians in a most odious light, and taxed them with having apostatized from the religion of the early Christians. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* viii. c. 17. But political considerations may have influenced him. Galerius contemplated getting rid of his colleagues, and making himself sole emperor. The Christians who were attached to Constantius Chlorus and his son, seemed to him to stand in the way of his designs; and he wished to weaken their power, or rather to annihilate it, as far as practicable. But Diocletian was not disposed to further

his cruel project. He was willing to exclude Christians from the palace and the army, and to compel all who served him at court or in the armies to offer sacrifices to the gods; but not to suspend over them penal laws and executions. Galerius would have had them all brought to the stake. A council was called, composed of learned civilians and officers in the army, which declared against the Christians. To this decision Hierocles, the governor of Bithynia, and one who afterwards wrote against the Christians, contributed not a little. But Diocletian would not yet give up entirely. He would consult the oracle of Apollo at Miletus; which likewise directed the extirpation of the Christians. But even Apollo could not move the superstitious emperor to the extreme of cruelty. He decreed indeed a persecution, but it was to cost no blood. It commenced with the demolition of the Christian temple at Nicomedia, and the burning of the books found in it. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* &c. p. 916—922. *Schd.*]

⁶ Augustine, *Bracependium collat. cum Donatistis*, c. 15. 17, in his *Opp.* tom. ix. p. 387. 390, and Baluze, *Miscellan.* tom. ii. p. 77. 92.

⁷ Optatus Milevit. *de Schismate Donatist.* l. i. § 13, p. 13, ed. du Pin.

⁸ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. viii. c. 6. Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 14. Constantine the Gr. *Oratio ad Sanctorem Cæsum*, c. 25.—[After the second conflagration, Galerius left Nicomedia, pre-

time there were insurrections in Armenia and in Syria; and, as their enemies charged the blame of these also upon the Christians, the emperor by a *new* edict ordered all bishops and ministers of holy things to be thrown into prison; and, by a *third* edict, soon after, he ordered that all these prisoners should be compelled by tortures and punishments to offer sacrifice to the gods⁹; for he hoped, if the bishops and teachers were once overcome, that the Christian churches would follow their example. A great multitude, accordingly, of excellent men, in every part of the Roman empire, Gaul only excepted, which *Constantius Chlorus* governed¹, either suffered capitally, or went to the mines.

§ 4. In the second year of this persecution, A.D. 304, *Dioctetian* published a *fourth* edict, at the instigation of his son-in-law and of other enemies to the Christian name. The magistrates were now directed to make free use of torture for forcing all Christians into worship of the gods². These orders being strictly obeyed by men in power, the Christian church was

tending to be afraid of being burnt up by the Christians. *Dioctetian* also compelled his wife and daughter to sacrifice to the gods, in proof that they were not Christians; and caused many Christians of his household and court to be cut off, and *Lionthimus*, the bishop of *Nicomedia*, with many of the clergy and common Christians, to undergo cruel deaths, because they refused to offer sacrifices to the gods. *Schl.*]

⁹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. viii. c. 6, and *de Martyribus Palestine*. [Introduction.]²—[Some degree of probability could be attached to the charge against the Christians, causing the insurrections from the fact that their inconsiderate zeal sometimes led them to deeds which had an aspect of rebellion. At the commencement of this persecution, for example, a very respectable Christian tore down the imperial edict against the Christians, which was set up in a public place. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. viii. c. 5. *Schl.*]

¹ Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutorum*, c. 15. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. viii. c. 13. 14.—[Constantius Chlorus presided over Spain and Britain, as well as Gaul. In Spain there were some martyrs; because Constantius not being present there in person, he could not prevent the rigorous execution of the decree of the senior

emperor. But in Gaul, where he was personally present, he favoured the Christians, as much as sound policy would permit. He suffered some of the churches to be demolished, and most of them to be shut up. And when the last edict of *Galerius* against the Christians was promulgated, he enjoined upon all his Christian servants to relinquish either their mode of worship or their offices; and when they had made their election, he deprived all those of their offices who resolved to adhere to Christian worship, and retained the others in his service. *Schl.*]

² Eusebius, *de Martyr. Palestine*, c. 3.—[*Dioctetian* was not yet willing the Christians should be put to death outright; his orders to the governors were couched in general terms, that they should compel the Christians, by all kinds of corporeal sufferings, to give honour to the heathen gods. See Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, l. ii. c. 51, compare Lactantius, *Instit. Divinar.* l. v. c. 11. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ix. c. 9, and l. viii. c. 12. Hence, according with the disposition of the several governors, was the execution of their imperial edict. Some only sent the Christians into banishment, when the attempt to make them offer sacrifices failed. Others deprived them of an eye, or lamed one of their

reduced to the last extremity³. *Galerius Maximianus*, therefore, no longer hesitated to disclose the secret designs that he had long entertained⁴. He required his father-in-law⁵, together with his colleague *Maximianus Hercules*, to divest themselves of their power, and constituted himself emperor of the East; leaving the West to *Constantius Chlorus*, whose health he knew to be infirm. He also associated with him in the government two assistants, of his own choosing; namely, *Maximinus*, his sister's son, and *Severus*; excluding altogether *Constantine*, afterwards styled *the Great*, the son of *Constantius Chlorus*⁶. This revolution in the Roman government restored peace to the Christians in the western provinces, which were under *Constantius*⁷;

feet by burning it; and others exposed them to wild beasts; or lacerated their bodies with iron hooks, or with the scourge, and afterwards sprinkled vinegar and salt on the wounds, or dropped melted lead into them. In Phrygia, a whole city with all its inhabitants was burnt to ashes, because not an individual in it would offer sacrifice. Lactantius, *Instit. Divinar.* lib. v. c. 11. Some Christians also brought death upon themselves, by holding religious meetings contrary to the emperor's prohibition, or by voluntarily presenting themselves before the governors, and requesting to be martyred. Sulpitius Severus, *Hist. Sacra*, lib. ii. c. 32, and Eusebius, *de Martyr. Palæstinae*, c. 3. *Schl.*]

³ Lactantius, *Instit. Divinar.* l. v. c. 11. — [With the exception of Gaul, streams of Christian blood flowed in all the provinces of the Roman empire. Every where the Christian temples lay in ruins, and all assemblies for worship were suspended. The major part had forsaken the provinces, and taken refuge among the barbarians. Such as were unable or unwilling to do this, kept themselves concealed, and were afraid for their lives if they appeared in public. The ministers of Christ were either slain, or mutilated and sent to the mines, or banished the country. The avaricious magistrates and judges had seized upon nearly all their church property and their private possessions. Many, through dread of undergoing torture, had made away with their own lives, and many had apostatized from the faith; and what remained of the Christian community, consisted of a few weak, poor, and timorous persons. *Schl.*]

⁴ [A.D. 305. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Diocletian. *Tr.*]

⁶ Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 18, 20. — [Galerius Maximianus was in more fear of the young prince Constantine, than of his father Constantius; the latter being a mild and sickly sovereign, while Constantine was of an ardent temperament, and at the same time greatly beloved by the people and the soldiers. Yet Galerius had this prince in his power; for he detained him at his court in Nicomedia, and if he found occasion, might have put him out of his way by assassination, or some other means. Indeed Galerius attempted this, especially in the year 306. Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 24. But Constantine saved himself by flight, and repaired to his father in Britain. This sagacity of the prince overset the whole plan of the emperor, and was the means of rescuing the Christian religion from its jeopardy. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus*, &c. p. 912, &c. *Schl.*]

⁷ Eusebius, *de Martyr. Palæstinae*, c. 13. — [Eusebius says expressly, that Italy, Sicily, Gaul, Spain, Mauritania, and Africa, enjoyed peace after the first two years of the persecution. Nor was this strange; for Constantius Chlorus, who governed Britain, Spain, and Gaul, was a friend to the Christians; and Severus, who in the character of a Caesar held the other western provinces, was obliged to show deference to Constantius as the emperor of the West. Neither was the debauched Severus, of himself, inclined to cruelty. Yet the Christians enjoyed less freedom under him, than under Constantius. See Optatus Milevitanus, *de Schismate Donatist.* l. i. c. 14, comp. c. 16. *Schl.*]

but in the eastern provinces, the persecution raged with even greater severity than before⁸.

§ 5. But Divine Providence frustrated the whole plan of *Galerius Maximianus*. For, *Constantius Chlorus* dying in Britain, in the year 306, the soldiery saluted his son *Constantine Augustus*, the very man known from achievements as *the Great*: an unlucky chance, which the tyrant⁹ had not only to bear, but also to approve. Soon after, a civil war broke out. For, *Maxentius*¹, the son-in-law of *Maximianus*, assumed himself the imperial dignity, because he could not bear to see it bestowed, by his father-in-law's mortifying partiality, upon *Severus*, and he took his father, *Maximianus Herculius*, for his colleague in the empire. In the midst of these commotions, *Constantine*, beyond all expectation, made his way to the imperial throne. The western Christians, those of Italy and Africa excepted, enjoyed a good degree of tranquillity and liberty during these civil wars². But the oriental churches experienced various fortune, adverse or tolerable, according to the political changes from year to year³. At length *Galerius Maximianus*, who had

⁸ Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 21.—[Lactantius here states, that *Galerius Maximianus* gave orders, that such Christians as could not by tortures be induced to sacrifice, should be roasted over a slow fire. Maximin, who governed Syria and Egypt, at first showed himself quite mild towards the Christians. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ix. c. 9. But afterwards he seemed to wish to surpass all other enemies of the Christians in cruelty towards them. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 952, &c. *Schl.*]

⁹ [Galerius. *Macl.*]

¹ [Son of the ex-emperor *Valerius Maximianus Herculius*. *Tr.*]

² [Constantine, as soon as he came into power, gave the Christians full liberty to profess and to practise their religion. Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 24, and *Institut. Divinar.* l. i. c. 1. This he did, not from a sense of justice, or from magnanimity, and still less from any attachment to the Christian religion, but from principles of worldly prudence. He wished to attach the Christians to his party, that they might protect him against the power and the machinations of *Galerius Maximian*. His brother-in-law, *Maxentius*, imitated his example, and with similar views; and therefore the Christians under him

in Africa and Italy enjoyed entire religious liberty. See Optatus Milevitanus, *de Schismate Donatist.* l. i. c. 16, and Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. viii. c. 14. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 952, &c. *Schl.*]

³ [In the eastern provinces, which were under the government of *Galerius Maximianus* and *C. Galerius Maximinus*, Christians were the most cruelly persecuted; as is manifest from various passages in Eusebius. Yet *C. G. Maximin* did not at all times treat them with equal severity. According to Euseb. (*de Martyr. Palest.* c. 9.) in the year 308, the persecution seemed to be at an end in Syria and Palestine: but it soon after recommenced, with increased severity. The cause of these vicissitudes is to be sought in the political state of things. In this year, *C. G. Maximin* assumed the title of *Cesar* in Syria, against the will of *Galerius Maximianus*; and the latter appeared about to declare war against the former; who therefore was indulgent towards the Christians, in order to secure their friendship. But as *Galerius Maximianus* was appeased, *C. G. Maximin* became more severe against the Christians, in order to ingratiate himself more effectually with the emperor. After a while, however, he

been the author of their heaviest calamities, being brought low by a terrific and protracted disease, and finding himself ready to die, in the year 311, issued a decree which restored peace to them, after they had endured almost unbounded sufferings¹.

§ 6. After the death of *Galerius Maximianus*², *Maximinus* and *Licinius*³ divided between themselves the provinces which had been governed by him. At the same time *Maxentius*, who held Africa and Italy, determined to make war upon *Constantine*, who governed in Spain and Gaul, in order to bring all the West under his authority. *Constantine* anticipated his designs, marched his army into Italy in the year 312, and in a battle fought at the Milvian bridge near Rome, routed the army of *Maxentius*. In the flight, the bridge broke down, and *Maxentius* falling into the Tiber, was drowned. After this victory, *Constantine*, with his colleague *Licinius*, immediately gave full liberty to the Christians of living according to their own institutions and laws; and this liberty was more clearly defined the following year, A.D. 313, in a new edict drawn up at Milan⁴. *Maximin*, indeed, who reigned in the East, was projecting new calamities for the Christians⁵, and menacing the emperors of the

alated his severity; and towards the end of the year 309 and in the beginning of 310, the Christians enjoyed great freedom (Euseb. *de Martyr. Palæstine*, c. 13); for *Galerius Maximianus* was now in declining health, and in such circumstances C. G. *Maximin* wished not to alienate the Christians from himself. But when the governor of the province informed him, in the year 310, that the Christians abused their freedom, *Maximin* renewed the persecution. But soon after *Galerius Maximianus* was seized with his last and fatal sickness, and C. G. *Maximin* being apprehensive that the imperial power could be secured only by a successful appeal to arms, policy required him again to desist from persecuting the Christians. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. viii. c. 16. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 955, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. viii. c. 16. *Laetantius, de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 33. —[The decree is given us, in Greek, by Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* l. viii. c. 17, and in Latin, by *Laetantius, de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 34. *Schl.*]

⁵ [A. D. 311. *Tr.*]

⁶ [Who was created *Augustus* by *Galerius Maximianus*, after the death of *Flavius Severus*, A. D. 307. *Tr.*]

⁷ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. x. c. 5. *Laetantius, de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 48. [It is the second edict, or that of Milan, which is found in the passages here referred to: Eusebius gives it in Greek, *Laetantius* in Latin. The first edict is wholly lost; yet from the second we may learn what was obscure or indefinite in the first. The first edict gave religious freedom, not only to the Christians, but to all other sects; yet it forbade any person abandoning the religion in which he had been born and brought up. This prohibition operated disadvantageously to the Christian cause, and occasioned many, who had recently embraced Christianity, to return to their former religion, in obedience to the imperial edict. This prohibition, therefore, with all other restraints, was removed in the second edict. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 959. *Schl.*]

⁸ [C. Gal. *Maximin* did not at first venture to contravene the edict of Gal. *Maximianus*, (giving full toleration to

West with war; but being vanquished by *Licinius*, he put an end to his own life by swallowing poison at Tarsus, in the year 313.

§ 7. About this time, *Constantine* the Great, who was previously a man of no religion, is said to have embraced Christianity; being chiefly moved by the miracle of a cross that he saw in the heavens. But this account is very doubtful. For his first edict in favour of the Christians, and many other things, sufficiently evince that he was indeed at that time well disposed towards the Christians and their worship, but that he by no means regarded Christianity as the only true and saving religion; on the contrary, it appears that he regarded other religions, and among them the old Roman religion, as likewise true and useful to mankind; and he therefore wished all religions to be freely practised throughout the Roman empire⁹.

the Christians,) yet he did not publish it in his provinces; but afterwards, by underhanded evasions, he violated it. For, if we may believe *Lactantius*, (*de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 36,) he slyly so managed, that what some cities petitioned for, namely, that the Christians might be prevented from erecting temples within their walls, was effected. *Eusebius* relates, (*Hist. Eccles.* l. x. c. 2,) that through the medium of one *Theoctenus*, he induced the *Antiochians* to petition to him, that no Christian might be allowed to reside in their city, and then granted them their petition. Other cities followed this example, and thus a new persecution was set on foot. Perhaps *Laetantius* and *Eusebius* erred, in representing *Maximin* as the original cause of these applications to himself. Such petitions were in fact presented; and as the emperor was about engaging in war with *Constantine*, he used every means to secure the fidelity of cities in the East to himself; and as the persecution of the Christians was one of the means to be used, therefore he gratified their wishes. Subsequently, when the first edict of *Constantine* and *Licinius* was brought to him, in the year 312, he would not suffer it to be published in his provinces; probably from pride, he deeming it unsuitable for him to be the publisher of edicts given out by persons whom he regarded as his inferiors in rank. Yet, according to *Eusebius*, (*Hist. Eccles.* l. ix. c. 9,) he sent a letter to his

governors of provinces, which was very favourable to the Christians, and in which he requested his subjects to treat them kindly and tenderly. The Christians, however, put no confidence in this letter, but were still afraid openly to profess their religion. But after he had been vanquished by *Licinius*, in the year 313, he published a new edict in favour of the Christians, (*Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* l. ix. c. 10,) in which he laments, that the judges and magistrates had misinterpreted the former law; and he now expressly gives the Christians liberty to rebuild their temples, and commands that the property taken from them should be restored. Soon after this he died, and the ten years' persecution ended. See *Mosheim, Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 961, &c. *Schl.*]

⁹ [This is evident from *Eusebius, de Vita Constantini*, l. i. c. 27. In the commencement of the war with *Maxentius*, he was still at a loss to what God he should trust himself and his affairs. He at length determined to honour that one God only whom his father had worshipped, and to show no reverence to the ancient Roman deities. The grounds on which he came to this decision were feeble: namely, the good fortune of his father, who adhered to this worship; and the ill fortune and lamentable end of *Diocletian*, *Galerius Maximian*, and other emperors, who had worshipped the pagan deities. And, according to *Eusebius, (de Vita Constantini*, l. i. c. 28,) he knew so little of the God of his

But as he advanced in life, *Constantine* made progress in religious knowledge, and gradually came to regard Christianity as the only true and saving religion, all others as false and impious. Having learned this, he now began to exhort his subjects to embrace Christianity; and at length he proclaimed war against the ancient superstitions. At what time this alteration in the emperor's views took place, and he began to look upon all religions but the Christian as false, cannot be determined. This is, however, certain, that the change was first made manifest by his laws and edicts, in the year 324 after the death of *Licinius*, when he became sole emperor¹. His purpose, however, of abolishing the ancient religion of the Romans, and of tolerating no other than the Christian, he did not disclose before the very end of life; when he issued edicts for pulling down the pagan temples and abrogating sacrifices².

father, that he prayed he might be able to know him. He was a *deist* of the lowest class, who considered the God of his father as a limited being, though more benevolent and powerful than any of the Greek and Roman deities. This is manifest from his regulations in favour of the Christians, and from his laws tolerating the pagan *haruspices*. *Codex Theodos.* l. ix. tit. 16, leg. 1, 2, and l. xvi. tit. 10, leg. i. Compare Zosimus, lib. ii. p. 10, ed. Oxford, 1679, 8vo. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 971, &c. *Schl.*]

¹ Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, l. ii. c. 20 and 44. [In this year, 324, all those who, for their adherence to Christianity during the preceding persecution, had become exiles, or been sent to the mines, or been robbed of their property, were restored to their country, their liberty, and their possessions; and the Christian temples were ordered to be rebuilt and enlarged. *Schl.*]

² See Ja. Godfrey, *ad Codicem Theodos.* tom. vi. pt. i. p. 290, &c. [The statement of Zosimus (lib. ii. p. 104,) is not to be wholly rejected. He says, that after the death of *Licinius*, a certain Egyptian came to Rome from Spain, and convinced the emperor of the truth of the Christian religion. No reason can be assigned why Zosimus should have fabricated such a story. This Egyptian was probably Hosius, the bishop of Corduba, who was a native Egyptian, and was then at the court of Constantine, very probably, soliciting

the restoration of the church goods which had been confiscated; at least, it is expressly stated, that the money destined for Africa was paid in consequence of his efforts. This conjecture is favoured by Baumgarten, *Auszug der Kirchengesch.* vol. ii. p. 691. The later Greeks ascribe the emperor's conversion to a courtier named Euphrates; of whom, however, the ancients make no mention. Theodoret (*Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 17,) ascribes it to the influence of Helena his mother; but she was brought to embrace Christianity by her son, according to Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, l. iii. c. 47.—Zosimus relates, further, that Constantine asked the pagan priests to absolve him from the guilt of destroying *Licinius*, *Fausta*, and *Crispus*; and when they told him this was impossible, the Egyptian, before mentioned, undertook to show that the Christian religion offered the means of cleansing away his guilt; and this it was induced the emperor to embrace Christianity. There is, perhaps, some degree of truth in this story; perhaps Constantine did, in fact, after the death of *Licinius*, first learn, either from this Egyptian, or from some others, that the blood of Christ was expiatory for believers therein. It is, at least, certain, that in the first years, after his victory over *Maxentius*, he had very incorrect ideas of Christ and of the Christian religion; as is manifest from his *Rescript. to Anulianus*, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. x. c. 7. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christ.* p. 976, &c. *Schl.*]

§ 8. That the emperor acted from real, not simulated motives, no one can doubt who considers men's actions any clue to their feelings. It is, indeed, true, that *Constantine's* life was not such as the precepts of Christianity required³; and it is also true, that he remained a *catechumen* all his life, and was received to full membership in the church, by baptism, only a few days before his death, at Nicomedia⁴. But neither of these is adequate proof that the emperor had not a general conviction of the truth of the Christian religion, or that he only feigned himself a Christian. For in that age many persons deferred baptism till near the close of life, that they might pass into the other world altogether pure and undefiled with sin⁵; and it is but too notorious, that many, who think nothing more true and divine than Christianity, live, notwithstanding, in violation of its precepts. It is another question, whether worldly reasons might not have had some share in making Constantine prefer the Christian religion to that of

³ [He put to death his own son Crispus, and his wife Fausta, on a groundless suspicion; and cut off his brother-in-law Licinius, and his unoffending son, contrary to his plighted word; and was much addicted to pride and voluptuousness. *Schl.*]

⁴ Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, lib. iv. c. 61, 62. Those who, in reliance on more recent and dubious authorities, maintain that Constantine received Christian baptism at Rome, in the year 324, and from the hands of Sylvester, then the bishop of Rome, do not at this day gain the assent of intelligent men, even in the Roman Catholic church. See Henry Norris, *Historia Donatist.* in his *Opp.* tom. iv. p. 650. Antio. Maria Marnachius, *Origines et Antiq. Christianæ*, tom. ii. p. 232, &c. [Valesius, in his Notes on Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, l. iv. c. 61, where Eusebius relates, that Constantine first received imposition of hands, previous to his baptism, a little before his death, infers, that the emperor then first became a *catechumen*, because he then first received imposition of hands. But the bishops laid hands on the catechumens at various times, and for various purposes: and the connexion here shows, that Eusebius refers to that imposition of hands which immediately preceded, and was connected with, baptism. See Tertullian, *de Baptismo*, c. 20. It will not follow, there-

fore, that Constantine had never before received imposition of hands for other purposes. But suppose he had not, still we do not know that the only mode of constituting a catechumen, in that age, was by imposition of hands: and if it was, so great an emperor might be excused from the ceremony which could plead no divine authority. That Constantine, long before this time, declared himself a *Christian*, and was acknowledged as such by the churches, is certain. It is also true that he had, for a long time, performed the religious acts of an unbaptized Christian, that is, of a *catechumen*; for he attended public worship, fasted, prayed, observed the Christian Sabbath, and the anniversaries of the martyrs, and watched on the vigils of Easter, &c. &c. Now these facts show that he had, in fact, long been a catechumen; and that he did not first become so, at the time hands were laid on him in order to his baptism. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 966, &c. *Tr.*—The learned author says there, that *catechumens* were made by the imposition of hands and prayer, and that this ceremony was repeated by the bishops a little before baptism, after a confession of sin, and a solemn renunciation of the devil. *Ed.*]

⁵ [See Ant. Fred. Busching's *Disput. de Procrastinatione Baptismi apud veteres, ejusque Causis.* *Schl.*]

ancient Rome and every other, and in his recommendation of it to his people. He may, indeed, have viewed it with a sovereign's eye, as a mighty instrument; while idolatry was none at all, for strengthening an empire and keeping subjects to their duty⁶.

§ 9. The sign of the cross, which *Constantine* most solemnly affirmed was seen by him in the heavens, near mid-day, is a subject involved in the greatest obscurities and difficulties. It is, however, an easy thing to refute those who regard this prodigy as a cunning fiction of the emperor, or who rank it among fables⁷; and also those who refer the appearance to natural causes, ingeniously conjecturing that a cross was formed

⁶ See Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, l. i. c. 27. [The Romans had then lost nearly all their former virtues, fidelity, good sense, and valour; and in their place, tyranny, profligacy, and shameful vices and crimes succeeded, and became prevalent, especially during the persecution of the Christians. Among the more intelligent, very little of the ancient superstitious spirit remained; so effectually had the Christian and pagan philosophers exposed the turpitude of the old religion. But among the Christians, who were spread far and wide in the Roman empire, and here and there had brought over some of the neighbouring nations to their religion, great firmness and stability of mind were manifest, together with good faith and honesty. Hence Constantine the Great might readily see, that the Christian religion would contribute much more to the tranquillity of the empire, and to the establishment of his dominion, than the old religion could do. *Schl.*]

⁷ Joh. Hornbeck, *Comment. ad Ballam Urbanum VIII. de Imaginum Cultu*, p. 182, &c. Ja. Oiscsius, *Thesaurus Numismat. antiquor.* p. 463. Ja. Tollius, Preface to his French translation of *Loujims*; and in his notes on Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 45. Christ. Thomasius, *Obscrvat. Hallens.* tom. i. p. 380; and others. [There is difference of opinion as to the time when, and the place where, the emperor saw this cross. Some follow Eusebius, (*de Vita Constantini*, l. i. c. 28,) and believe that he saw it while in Gaul, and when making preparations for the war with Maxentius. Others rely on the testimony of Lactantius, (*de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 44,) and believe that he

saw the cross on the 26th day of October, A. D. 312, [the day before the battle in which Maxentius was vanquished, near Rome.] So thought Stephan. Baluze; (see his Notes on this passage in *Lactantius*;) whom Pagi, Fabricius, and others have followed. The point is a difficult one to decide; and the brothers Ballerini (*Observ. ad Norisii Hist. Donatist.* Opp. tom. iv. p. 662,) would compromise it, by supposing there were two appearances of the cross, both in dreams, the first in Gaul, and the last in Italy; which is a miserable shift. Among those who regard the whole story as a fabrication, some suppose that it was a pious fraud, and others that it was a trick of state. The first supposition is most improbable. For, at the time when the cross is said to have appeared to him, Constantine thought nothing about spreading the Christian religion, but only about vanquishing Maxentius. Besides, he was not then a Christian, and did not use the event for the advancement of Christianity, but for the animation of his troops. The other supposition has more probability; indeed, Licinius once resorted to something like this, according to Lactantius, *de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 46. But Constantine solemnly averred the reality of this prodigy; and if he had been inclined to use artifice, in order to enkindle courage in his soldiers, he would far more probably, as his army was made up chiefly of barbarians, and such as were not Christians, (see *Zosimus*, l. ii. p. 86,) have represented Mars, or some other of the vulgar deities, as appearing to him. See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.* p. 978, &c. *Schl.*]

in a solar halo, or in the moon^o; and likewise those who ascribe the thing to divine power, then exerted for the confirmation by a miracle of Constantine's wavering faith^o. Each

⁸ See Joh. Andr. Schmidt, *Diss. de Lanna in Cruce visa*, Jena, 1681, 4to, and Joh. Albert. Fabricius, *Diss. de Cruce a Constantino visa*, in his *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. vi. cap. i. p. 8, &c.—[This opinion also has its difficulties. Fabricius himself admits, that, on his hypothesis, the appearance of visible words in the air cannot be explained. And he resorts to a new exposition of the language of Eusebius for relief; and believes that the words, *By this conquer*, (τοῦτω νικᾷ, *hæc vince*), were not actually seen, but that the sense of them was emblematically depicted in a crown of victory that appeared in the heavens. But (1) if the emperor intended to say this, he expressed himself very obscurely. (2) It is certain, that Constantine did not intend to be so understood; for he caused the very words mentioned to be affixed to the standards (*Labara*) of the legions, and to the medals and other monuments of the event; which he would not have done, had he not designed it should be understood, that these words were actually seen in the heavens. (3) All the ancient writers so understood the account given by Eusebius. (4) Such a halo about the sun, as that described by the emperor, has never been seen by man. For he did not see the *sign* or *form* of a real cross, but the *Greek letter X*, intersected perpendicularly by

the letter P, thus  [Euseb. *de Vita*

Constant. l. i. § 31.] See Mosheim, *Comment. de Rebus Christ.* p. 935. *Schl.*]

⁹ [Eusebius alone, (*de Vita Constantini*, l. i. c. 28–31,) among the writers of that age, gives us any account of the vision of the cross; though Laetantius (*de Mortib. Persecutor.* c. 44,) and others speak of the “*dream*,” in which Constantine was directed to use the sign of the cross. Eusebius' account is as follows: “He conceived that he ought to worship only the God of his father. He therefore called upon this God, in prayer, entreating and beseeching him, to manifest to him who he was, and to extend his right arm, on the present occasion. While he was thus praying with earnest entreaty, a most singular divine manifestation (θεοσημία τις παραδοξοτάτη)

appeared: which, perhaps, had another declared it, would not easily be credited: but the victorious emperor himself having related it, to us who write this, when we had, a long time afterwards, the privilege of knowing and conversing with him, and having confirmed it with an oath; who can hesitate to believe the account? and especially, as the subsequent time [for the events which followed] affords evidence of its truth? He said that, about the middle hours of the day, as the sun began to verge towards its setting, he saw in the heavens, with his own eyes, the sun surmounted with the trophy of the cross, (ὑπερκείμενον τοῦ ἡλίου σταυροῦ τρόπαιον,) which was composed of light, and had a legend (γραφὴν) annexed, saying, *By this conquer*. And amazement seized him, and the whole army, at the sight, (ἐπὶ τῷ θεάματι,) and the beholders wondered, as they accompanied him in the march. And he said, he was at a loss what to make of this spectre, (τί ποτε εἶη τὸ φάσμα,) and as he pondered and reflected upon it long, night came upon him by surprise. After this, as he slept, (ὕπνου δυνάμει,) the Christ of God appeared to him, together with the sign before seen in the heavens, and bade him make a representation of the sign that appeared in the heavens, and to use that as a protection (τοῦτω ἀεὶ ἔχουματι χρῆσθαι) against the onsets of his enemies. As soon as it was day, he arose, related the wonder (τὸ ἀνόρητον) to his friends; and then assembling the workers in gold and precious stones, he seated himself in the midst of them, and describing the appearance of the sign (τοῦ σημείου), he bade them imitate it in gold and precious stones. This we were once so fortunate as to set our eyes upon.” Eusebius then goes into a long description of this sacred standard, which was called the *Labarum*. Its shaft was a very long spear, overlaid with gold. On its top was a crown composed of gold and precious stones, and containing the sacred symbol, namely, the Greek letter X, intersected with the letter P. Just under this crown was a likeness of the emperor, in gold; and below that, a cross piece of wood, from which hung a square

of these suppositions has, indeed, been overthrown, and nothing, then, is left, but to suppose, that *Constantine* saw in a dream, while asleep, the appearance of a cross, with the inscription, *By this conquer*¹. Nor is this opinion unsupported by competent authorities of good credit².

§ 10. The happiness anticipated by the Christians from the edicts of *Constantine* and *Licinius*, was a little afterwards inter-

flag, of purple cloth embroidered and covered with precious stones. — Now, if this narrative is all true, and if two connected miracles were actually wrought, as here stated, how happens it, that no writer of that age, except Eusebius, says one word about the luminous cross in the heavens?—How came it, that Eusebius himself said nothing about it in his *Eccles. History*, which was written twelve years after the event, and about the same length of time before his *Life of Constantine*? Why does he rely solely on the testimony of the emperor, and not even intimate that he ever heard of it from others; whereas, if true, many thousands must have been eye-witnesses of the fact!—What mean his suggestions, that some may question the truth of the story; and his caution not to state any thing as a matter of public notoriety, but to confine himself simply to the emperor's private representation to himself!—Again, if the miracle of the luminous cross was a reality, has not God himself sanctioned the use of the cross, as the appointed symbol of our religion? so that there is no superstition in the use of it; but, the Catholics are correct, and the Protestants in an error, on this subject?—If God intended to enlighten Constantine's dark mind, and show him the truth of Christianity, would he probably use for the purpose the enigma of a luminous cross, in preference to his inspired word, or a direct and special revelation? Was there no tendency to encourage a superstitious veneration for the sign of the cross, in such a miracle?—And can it be believed, that Jesus Christ actually appeared to the emperor, in a vision, directing him to make an artificial cross, and to *rely upon that*, as his defence in the day of battle?—But how came the whole story of the luminous cross to be unknown to the Christian world, for more than twenty-five years, and then to transpire only through a

private conversation between Eusebius and Constantine?—Is it not supposable, that Eusebius may have misunderstood the account the emperor gave him, of a singular halo about the sun, which he saw, and of an affecting dream which he had the night after, and which induced him to make the *Labarum*, and use it as his standard?—Such are the arguments against this hypothesis. *Tr.*]

[Lactantius mentions only the dream; and the same is true of Sozomen, lib. i. c. 3; and Rufinus, in his translation of the *Eccles. History* of Eusebius; and likewise, of the author of the *Chronicon Orientale*, p. 57. Indeed the appeal of Eusebius to the solemn attestation of the emperor, (*de Vita Constantini*, l. i. c. 28,) and the statement of Gelasius Cyzicenus, (*Acta Concilii Niceni*, lib. i. c. 4, in Harduin's *Concilia*, tom. i. p. 351,) that the whole story was accounted fabulous by the pagans, confirm the supposition, that it was a mere dream. For the appeal of Eusebius would have been unnecessary, and the denial of its reality by the pagans would have been impossible, if the whole army of Constantine had been eye-witnesses of the event. *Schl.*]

² The writers who treat of Constantine the Great, are carefully enumerated by Joh. Alb. Fabricius, *Lux salutaris Evangelii toti orbi exorientis*, c. 12, p. 260, &c. [The latest and by far the best (says Heeren, *Ancient Hist.* p. 475, ed. Bancroft, 1828,) is, *Leben Constantin des Grossen*, von J. C. F. Manso, Bresl. 1817.] Fabricius moreover (ibid. c. 13, p. 273, &c.) describes the laws of Constantine, relating to religious matters, under four heads. The same laws are treated of by Jac. Godfrey, *Adnot. ad Codicem Theodosianum*; and in a particular treatise, by Francis Baldwin, in his *Constantinus Magn. seu de Legibus Constantinis Ecclesiast. et Civilibus*, lib. ii. ed. 2nd, by B. Gundling, Halle, 1727, 8vo.

rupted by *Licinius*, who waged war against his kinsman *Constantine*. Being vanquished in the year 314, he was quiet for about nine years. But in the year 324, this restless man again attacked *Constantine*, being urged on both by his own inclination and by the instigation of the pagan priests. That he might secure to himself a victory, he attached the pagans to his cause, by severely oppressing the Christians, and cruelly putting not a few of their bishops to death³. But his plans failed once more. For, after several unsuccessful battles, he was obliged to throw himself upon the mercy of the victor, who, nevertheless, ordered him to be strangled, in the year 325. After his victory over *Licinius*, *Constantine* reigned sole emperor till his death; and by policy, enactments, regulations, and munificence, endeavoured as much as possible to obliterate gradually the ancient superstitions, and to establish Christian worship throughout the Roman empire⁴. He had, undoubtedly, learned from the wars and the machinations of *Licinius*, that neither himself nor the Roman empire could remain secure while the ancient superstition continued prevalent; and therefore, from this time onward, he openly opposed the pagan

³ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. x. c. 8, and *de Vita Constantini*, l. i. c. 49. Even Julian, than whom no one was more prejudiced against Constantine, could not but pronounce Licinius an infamous tyrant, who was sunk in vices and crimes. See Julian's *Cæsares*, p. 222, ed. Spanheim. I would here observe, what appears to have been overlooked hitherto, that Aurelius Victor mentions this persecution of Licinius, in his book *de Cæsaribus*, c. 41, p. 435, ed. Arntzenii, where he says: *Licinio ne insontium quidem ac nobilium philosophorum servili more cruciatus adhibiti modum fecere*. The *Philosophers*, whom Licinius is here said to have tortured, were, doubtless, *Christians*; whom many, from their slight acquaintance with our religion, have mistaken for a sect of philosophers. The commentators on Aurelius have left this passage untouched; which is apt to be the case with those who are intent only on the enlargement of grammatical knowledge derived from ancient writers.

⁴ [Constantine doubtless committed errors, which, in their consequences, were injurious to the cause of Christianity. He gave to the clergy the

former privileges of the pagan priests, and allowed legacies to be left to the churches, which were every where erected and enlarged. He was gratified with seeing the bishops assume great state; for he thought, the more respect the bishops commanded, the more inclined the pagans would be to embrace Christianity: and thus he introduced the love of pomp and display among the clergy. *Schl.*—It will be seen in section 12, that Julian made war upon Christianity, by abrogating its privileges, and closing its schools for the refinement of mankind. This is no mean testimony to the soundness of Constantine's liberality. So, as far as Christian ministers, indeed, are personally concerned, there is no justice in their exclusion from such circumstances of comfort and respectability as are open to their kinsmen and compatriots generally. Nor will their ministry carry the weight which the best interests of the world at large require, unless it is allowed to take its due place among liberal professions; which it never can, while hopelessly confined among poverty-stricken employments. *Ed.]*

deities and their worship, as prejudicial to the interests of the state.

§ 11. After the death of *Constantine*, which happened in the year 337, his three surviving sons, *Constantine II.*, *Constantius*, and *Constans*, assumed the empire, and were all saluted *Augusti* and emperors by the Roman senate. There were still living two brothers of *Constantine the Great*, namely, *Constantius Dalmatius*, and *Julius Constans*, and they had several sons. But nearly all these were slain by the soldiers at the command of *Constantine's* sons, who feared lest their thirst for power might lead them to make insurrections and disturb the commonwealth⁵. Only *Gallus* and *Julian*, sons of *Julius Constans*, with some difficulty, escaped the massacre⁶; and the latter of these afterwards became emperor. *Constantine II.* held Britain, Gaul, and Spain; but lost his life A. D. 340, in a war with his brother *Constantius*. *Constans* at first governed only Illyricum, Italy, and Africa; but after the fall of his brother *Constantine II.* he annexed his provinces to his empire, and thus became emperor of all the West, until he lost his life A. D. 350, in the war with *Magnentius*, a usurper. After the death of *Constans*, *Magnentius* being subdued, the third brother, *Constantius*, who had before governed Asia, Syria, and Egypt, in the year 353 became sole emperor, and governed the whole empire till the year 361, when he died. No one of these brothers possessed the disposition or the discernment of their father; yet they all pursued their father's purpose of abolishing the ancient superstitions of the Romans and other pagans, and of propagating the Christian religion throughout the Roman empire. The thing itself was commendable and excellent; but in the means employed there was much to censure⁷.

⁵ ["It is more probable, that the principal design of this massacre was to recover the provinces of Thrace, Macedonia, and Achaia, which, in the divisions of the empire, *Constantine the Great* had given to young *Dalmatius*, son of his brother of the same name; and *Pontus* and *Cappadocia*, which he had granted to *Annibalianus*, the brother of young *Dalmatius*. Be that as it will, Dr. Mosheim has attributed this massacre equally to the three sons of *Constantine*; whereas almost all authors agree, that neither young *Constantine*, nor *Constans*, had any hand in it at all." *Maccl.*]

⁶ [Because they were despised: *Gallus*, being sickly, it was supposed would not live long; and *Julian*, being but eight years old, created no fear. Some years after, they were sent to a remote place in *Cappadocia*, where they were instructed in languages, the sciences, and gymnastics, being in a sense kept prisoners; and were at last designed for the clerical office, having been made lecturers or readers. *Ammianus Marcell.* l. xlii. c. 9. *Schl.*]

⁷ [Coercive measures were adopted, which only made nominal Christians. A law was enacted, in the year 342, that all the heathen temples should be shut

§ 12. The cause of Christianity, which had been thus flourishing and prosperous, received immense injury, and seemed on the brink of ruin, when *Julian*, the son of *Julius Constantius*, brother of *Constantine* the Great, now the only surviving branch of the Constantinian family⁸, after a successful campaign in Gaul, A. D. 360, was hailed emperor by his soldiers, and on the death of *Constantius*, A. D. 361, obtained possession of the whole empire. This credulous and vain-glorious prince was, indeed, educated in the Christian religion, but he spurned it; partly from hatred of the Constantinian family, which had slain his father, brother, and others of his race; partly from the cunning of the Platonic philosophers, who imposed upon him with fictitious miracles and prophecies. He took up in its place the principles of his forefathers, and strove to reinstate the rites of paganism in all their former splendour. *Julian* seemed to abhor all violence, and to leave his people full discretion in religion and its outward forms; but he really cut, by art and policy, the sinews of the Christian cause. He abrogated privileges granted as well to that religion itself, as to its principal officers, closed its schools of philosophy and liberal arts, not only tolerated all its opponents, but also inspired and favoured them in writing books against the Christians, and in other things. He had more objects in contemplation, and would, doubtless, have done immense harm to Christianity, if he had returned victorious from the Persian war, which he undertook directly after he came to the throne. But in this war, which was both undertaken and carried on with little discretion, he fell by a wound received in battle, A. D. 363, when just entered on the thirty-second year of his age, and after reigning sole emperor only twenty months from the death of *Constantius*⁹.

up, and that no person should be allowed to go near them. All sacrifices, and all consultations of the oracles and sooth-sayers, were prohibited, on pain of death and confiscation of property: and the provincial magistrates were threatened with the same penalties, if they were dilatory in punishing transgressors of the law. This was to compel the conscience, and not to convince it. The history of these emperors may be found in the *Universal History*, and in Le Beau's *History of the Eastern Empire*. *Schl.*]

⁸ [For Gallus, who had been created Cæsar, was previously murdered by order of Constantius, because of his cruelty, and being charged with aspiring after the supreme power. Ammian. Marcell. l. xiv. c. 11. *Schl.*]

⁹ See, besides Tillemont, [the *Universal History*; Le Beau, *Histoire du bas Empire*, tom. iii. liv. xii—xiv.] and other common writers, the accurately written work of Bletterie, *Vie de Julien*, Paris, 1734, and Amsterd. 1735, 8vo; the *Life and Character of Julian the Apostate*, illustrated in VII. *Disserta-*

§ 13. Those who rank *Julian* among the greatest heroes of any age, may, place him first among all who ever filled a throne, which now many do, they too persons learned and acute¹, are either hindered by their prepossessions from seeing

tions, by Des Vaux, Dublin, 1746, 8vo; Ez. Spanheim, Preface and Notes to the Works of Julian, Lips. 1696, fol.; and Joh. Alb. Fabricius, *Lux salutaris Evangelii toti orbi exorients*, cap. xiv. p. 294, &c. [Add Aug. Neander, *über Kayser Julianus und sein Zeitalter*, Hamb. 1812, 8vo. Tr.]

¹ Montesquieu, *Esprit des Loix*, liv. xxiv. c. 10, says: *Il n'y a point eu après lui de prince plus digne de gouverner des hommes.* [To form a correct judgment of Julian, it is necessary cursorily to survey the history of his life. He was born A.D. 331; and lost his mother Basilina, the same year; and his father, Julius Constantius, a few years after. Mardonius, a eunuch, and Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, were his first instructors. When Gallus was made a Caesar, Julian obtained permission to come to Constantinople, where he attended the public schools; then he went to Bithynia, every where attaching himself to the most noted teachers; and read and imitated the orations of Libanius, a pagan sophist, whom he was strictly forbidden to hear. At Pergamus he became acquainted with Altesius, an aged Platonic philosopher, and heard his scholars, Eusebius and Chrysanthus, as also Maximus, of Ephesus, who initiated him in theurgia, brought him to apostatize from Christianity, and presaged his elevation to the throne. This change in his religion he was obliged to conceal from Constantius and Gallus. Julian, therefore, devoted himself to a monastic life, assumed the tonsure, and became a public reader in the church at Nicomedia. In the year 354, after the death of Gallus, he was deprived of his liberty, and carried to Milan. After being in custody there seven months, he obtained, by the intercession of the empress Eusebia, a release, and liberty to travel into Greece, where he applied himself, at Athens, to the sciences and to eloquence, and became acquainted with Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus. In the year 355, he was proclaimed Caesar, and had Gaul, Spain, and Britain entrusted to him. But Constantius greatly limited his power, and nominated not only the military commanders there,

but also the officers of Julian's court who were to keep strict watch over him. To this his elevation Eusebia contributed much, she being anxious about the succession to the throne, on account of her continued barrenness; and the rebellion of Sylvanus, which took place in the beginning of this year, as also the continual incursions of the bordering nations which required a general in Gaul, favoured the measure. Julian performed some successful campaigns in Gaul, which procured him the affections not only of the soldiery, but likewise of all the Gallic subjects. This awakened the jealousy of Constantius, who, under pretext of the Persian war, recalled a great part of the troops from Gaul. In the spring of 360, the soldiers proclaimed Julian Augustus, and compelled him to assume that dignity. A reconciliation was attempted in vain. Constantius insisted upon it, that Julian should resign. Julian prosecuted the German war successfully, and strengthened and fortified the frontiers; and after vanquishing the Germans, whom Constantius had excited against him, and subduing Illyria and Italy, he marched unenumbered against Constantius, who came forward to meet him, but was taken sick on the way, and died in Cilicia. Julian now took quiet possession of the whole Roman empire; caused Constantius to be honourably buried; but called his principal officers to account, before a special court, as the authors of numerous acts of violence. He likewise attempted great reforms in the court, in which prodigality and pomp had risen to a great height. He also dismissed many useless officers; and filled his court with philosophers and soothsayers, to whom he showed particular respect. During the Illyrian campaign, in the year 361, he publicly sacrificed to the gods; and after the death of Constantius, he let it be distinctly known, that it was his purpose to re-instate idolatrous worship. But, as he was aware of the ill consequences which formerly resulted from direct persecution, and wished to avoid the repetition of them, and coveted the reputation of being

the truth, or have never read attentively his writings which remain, or lastly, do not know what really deserves the name

magnanimous and benevolent, and as, in prospect of his Persian campaign, he stood in fear of the numerous body of Christians, he endeavoured to assail and to undermine them by artifice. For this purpose, he adopted the following measures. *First*, he endeavoured to reform the pagan idolatry, and to introduce improvements in it derived from the Christian worship. With this view, he attended to his official duties as *Pontifex Maximus*, with more earnestness than any of his predecessors; and even treated them as of more consequence than the government of the empire. He offered sacrifices daily in his palace and garden; attended the public sacrifices on all the pagan festivals, and officiated personally in them, without the least regard to decorum, even as to the meanest service. He re-established the public sacrifices of the cities and provinces. Where there were no temples, or where the destroyers of the ancient temples could not be found, or were his own predecessors, there he erected temples at his own cost, and gave to the idolatrous priests high rank and large revenues. As he had been converted to paganism by philosophers, who were of the new Platonic school, and who held much to theurgy, magic, divination, and apparitions, and were willing to borrow from Christianity, hence originated many burdensome purifications, and prolix ceremonies of worship, together with a considerable aping of Christian institutions. He was strenuous for the virtuous behaviour, the morality and beneficence, of the priests; and he forbade their going to theatres, or having much intercourse with those in civil authority. He wished to place the reading of useful books, giving public exhortations, and taking care of the poor, the sick, and funerals, on the same footing as they were among the Christians: and he required, that the priests in many places should annually be supplied with corn, and wine, and money, which they were to distribute to the poor. *Secondly*, he supported and extended more widely the internal divisions among the Christians. For he restored all silenced and ejected teachers, and required that such parties as had been laid under ecclesiastical censures, should be re-instated in their privileges. He wrote letters

to the most noted and restless heretics, and encouraged them to disseminate their doctrines. He allowed the leading members of the different parties to come to him, and under colour of attempting to reconcile their differences, he inflamed them more against each other. *Thirdly*, he deprived the clergy of the franchises and permanent incomes which they had enjoyed under the former emperors; especially of their exemption from burdensome civil duties, and of the distribution of corn to the churches from the emperor's storehouses; and he compelled the monks and the ministers of religion, by force, to perform military duty. *Fourthly*, he excluded the Christians from all promotions, and in terms of bitter sarcasm forbade their access to the public schools, their studying the Greek authors and sciences, and their practising physic. *Fifthly*, he commanded the idolatrous temples, images, and altars, to be rebuilt, at the cost of those who had pulled them down. *Sixthly*, acts of violence done by pagans to Christians, he either did not punish at all, or punished very slightly, only requiring them to make restitution. On the contrary, every tumult among Christians was punished most severely; and commonly, the bishops and the churches were made accountable for them. *Seventhly*, he connected idolatry with all solemn transactions, and with the manifestations of respect due to himself, and made a participation in it unavoidable. The soldiers, for instance, when extraordinary gratuities were presented them, must strew incense upon an altar; and to all the publicly exhibited pictures of the emperor, idolatrous deities were attached. *Eighthly*, he ridiculed the Christians and their worship scornfully; and wrote books in confutation of their doctrines. His work against Christianity, which was composed in the year 363, and in part during his Persian campaign, is lost. Indeed, the Marquis d'Argens', in the *Défense du Paganisme, par l'Empereur Julien, en Grec et François, avec des Dissertations et Notes*, Berlin, 1764, 8vo, has endeavoured to recover this work, by means of the confutation of it by Cyril. But the recovery is very incomplete. Yet these remains of it show, that the book was more likely to injure Christianity, by the style in which it

of great and excellent. If we set genius aside, which his writings, however, show him to have possessed but moderately, then, military courage, love of letters, acquaintance with that senseless and useless philosophy, called later Platonism, lastly, patience of labour, all other things in *Julian* are unquestionably little and unworthy of commendation. His excellences were counterbalanced by very great defects; first, a monstrous and almost anile superstition, the surest indication of a petty mind; then, a puerile hankering after glory and vulgar popularity, extreme credulity and instability, a proneness to cunning and artifice, finally, ignorance of solid and sound philosophy. I will grant that, in some respects, he was superior to the *sons* of Constantine the Great; but in many ways was he inferior to *Constantine himself*, whom he disparages without measure.

§ 14. As *Julian* affected an appearance of indisposition to trouble any citizen on a religious account, and professed hostility to no sect whatever, he showed so much indulgence to the Jews, as to give them liberty to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem. The Jews commenced the work, but were obliged to desist before even the foundations were laid. For balls of fire issued from the ground, accompanied with a great explosion and a tremendous earthquake, which dispersed both the materials that were collected and the workmen. The fact itself is abundantly attested²; though the Christians, as often happens in

was written, and by the perversion of Scripture, than by either the strength or the originality of its arguments and objections. Ninth and lastly, the emperor showed much partiality to the Jews, and allowed them to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, in order to confute by facts the prediction of Christ. Immediately after, there were banishments, tortures, and executions of Christians, under pretence that they had showed themselves refractory against the commands of the emperor; and there were many, especially in the eastern provinces, who became apostates. Yet there were not wanting resolute confessors to the Christian religion. See Baumgarten's *Auszug der Kirchenforsch.* vol. ii. p. 763, 780, 792, &c. *Schl.*]

² See Joh. Alb. Fabricius, *Lux salutis Evangelii toti orbi exorientis*, p. 124, where the testimonies are collected. See also the acute English knight, Walter Moyle, *Posthumous Works*, p. 101,

&c. [The principal authorities cited by Fabricius are, Chrysostom, *Homil. v. ad c. Judeos*, et alibi sæpius; Ammianus Marcell. lib. xxiii. c. i.; Gregory Naz. *Orat. iv.*; Ambrose, *Ep. 40* (al. 29, written A.D. 386); Socrates, *H. E. lib. iii. c. 20*; Sozomen, *H. E. lib. v. c. 21*; Theodoret, *H. E. lib. iii. c. 20*; Rufinus, *H. E. lib. i. c. 37*; Philostorgius, *H. E. lib. vii. c. 9, 14*; *Hist. Eccles. Tripartita*, l. vi. c. 43; Nicephorus, l. x. c. 32; Zonaras, l. xiii. c. 12; Rabbi David Gantz, *Zemach David*, pt. ii. p. 36; Rabbi Gedaliah, *Schelschelet Hakkabala*, p. 109.—Dr. Lardner (*Collection of Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, vol. iv. p. 57—71, ed. Lond. 1767) maintains the whole story to be false. His chief arguments are, that Julian only purposed to rebuild the temple, after his Persian expedition; that he needed all his resources for that expedition; the silence of some of the fathers, living near the time; and the decorations of the story

such cases, appear to have amplified it, inconsiderately, with some additional miracles. As to the causes which produced the event, there is room for debate, and there *is* debate. All however who weigh the subject with an impartial mind, will easily perceive, that they must join with those who ascribe the phenomenon to the omnipotent will of God; and that they who choose to ascribe it to natural causes, or to artifice and fraud, offer no objections which are insurmountable³.

§ 15. The soldiers elected *Jovian* to succeed *Julian*. He died in the year 364, after reigning seven months; and, therefore, accomplished but little⁴. The other emperors of this century, who reigned after *Jovian*, were *Valentinian I.*⁵, *Valens*, then *Gratian*⁶, *Valentinian II.*, *Honorius*⁷. All these were Christians, who deserved well of the religion which they professed, and endeavoured, though not with equal zeal, to extir-

by others of them. But these arguments seem wholly insufficient, against the explicit testimony of so many credible witnesses, Christians and pagans, and several of them contemporary with the event. *Tr.*]

³ Ja. Basnage, in his *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. iv. p. 1257, &c. contests the reality of this miracle. Against him appeared Gish. Cuperus, in his *Epistole*, p. 400, edited by Bayer. Recently, Wm. Warburton has maintained the reality of the miracle, with an excess of ingenuity, in an appropriate treatise, entitled: *Julian, or a Discourse concerning the earthquake and fiery eruption, which defeated that emperor's attempt to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem*; London, 1750, 8vo.

⁴ See Bletterie, *Vie de Jovien*, 2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1748, in which work he completes the history of Julian, and gives a French translation of some of Julian's writings.—[The following notices are worth inserting. Both during the lifetime of Julian, and after his death when the soldiers made him emperor, *Jovian* openly declared himself on the side of Christianity. For when Julian gave orders to all the military officers who were Christians, either to quit the army, or renounce their religion, *Jovian* chose to relinquish his office. But Julian would not release him, but gave him promotion during the Persian war. When chosen emperor, *Jovian* would not accept the office, until

the army had declared themselves in favour of Christianity. When he arrived at Antioch, he repealed all the laws of Julian, adverse to Christianity, (*Rafinus*, lib. xi. c. 1, and *Sozomen*, l. vi. c. 3,) and wrote to all the provincial governors, commanding them to take diligent care, that the Christians should not be disturbed in their public assemblies. He restored to the churches the clergy, and to widows all the franchises and privileges which had been granted them by Constantine and his sons, but which Julian had taken from them. He likewise restored the use of the *Labrum*, or the standard with a cross; and he compelled one Magnus to rebuild the church of Berytus, at his own cost, he having commanded it to be demolished. *Theodoret*, lib. iv. c. 19. In regard to the religious controversies of that day, he joined with the orthodox against the Arians; and he treated Athanasius with peculiar respect. See Baumgarten's *Auszug der Kirchenhistorie*, vol. ii. p. 605, and the *Universal History*. *Sch.*]

⁵ [In the West, from A. D. 364—375, with Valens in the East, from A. D. 364—378. *Tr.*]

⁶ [In the West, A. D. 375—383, with Valentinian II. also in the West, A. D. 375—392, and *Theodosius the Great* in the East, A. D. 379—395. *Tr.*]

⁷ [In the West, A. D. 395—423, with Arcadius, in the East, A. D. 395—408. *Tr.*]

pate wholly the heathen rites. In this particular, *Theodosius* the Great, the last emperor of this century⁸, exceeded all the rest. He came to the throne A.D. 389, and died A.D. 395. So long as he lived, no means were left untried, within his power, to overthrow idolatry through all the Roman provinces, and severe laws were enacted by him against adherents to it. The same design was prosecuted by his sons *Arcadius* and *Honorius*; so that as the century declined, all hope and credit of the ancient superstition wore away⁹.

§ 16. No such severity was, however, used, as prevented fanes and ceremonies from continuing to a great extent, especially in the remoter provinces. Indeed, these rigorous laws against worshippers of the pagan deities seem to have been aimed rather against the common people, than against persons of rank and distinction. For it appears, that during the reign of *Theodosius*, as well as after his death, individuals filled the highest offices, and continued in them till old age, who are known to have been averse from Christianity and attached to paganism. Of this *Libanius* is an example, who was very hostile to the Christians, and yet was made præfect of the prætorian guards by *Theodosius* himself. Perhaps greater indulgence was shown to philosophers, rhetoricians, and military commanders, than to other people, on account of their supposed usefulness to the commonwealth.

§ 17. Yet these very rhetoricians and philosophers, whose schools were supposed to be so profitable to the community, exhausted all their ingenuity, both before the days of *Constantine* the Great, and afterwards, to arrest the progress of Christianity. In the beginning of this century, *Hierocles*, the great ornament of the Platonic school, composed two books against the Christians; in which he had the audacity to compare our Saviour with *Apollonius Tyaneus*, and for which he was chastised by *Eusebius*¹ in a tract written expressly against him².

⁸ [In the East, except *Arcadius*. *Tr.*]

⁹ See the laws of these emperors, in favour of the Christian religion, and against the professors and friends of the ancient religion, in the *Code Theodosianus*, tom. vi., and Peter and Jerome Ballerini, Diss. i. in *Zenonen Veronensem*, p. 45, &c. Verona, 1739, fol.

¹ [Casariensis. *Tr.*]

² [*Hierocles*, who flourished about A. D. 303, was governor of Bithynia, and

afterwards præfect of Egypt. He was a zealous persecutor of the Christians, and wielded both the sword and the pen against them. His character and his two books, addressed to the Christians, are thus described by *Lactantius*, *Institut. Divinar.* l. v. c. 2, 3. "He was one of the judges, and was the principal author of the persecution [under Diocletian]. But not content with this crime, he also attacked with his pen the people he

Lactantius speaks of another philosopher who endeavoured, in three books, to convince the Christians of error; but his name is not mentioned³. After the reign of *Constantine* the Great, besides *Julian*, who wrote a large volume against the Christians, *Himerius*⁴ and *Libanius*⁵, in their public declamations, and *Eunapius*, in his lives of the philosophers, zealously decried the Christian religion⁶. Yet no one of these persons was punished for licentiousness of tongue or pen.

persecuted: for he composed two books, —not against the Christians, lest he should seem to address them as an enemy,—but to the Christians, that he might appear friendly to them and anxious for their good. In these books he endeavours to prove the falsehood of the Scriptures, by making them appear full of contradictions.—“He particularly assailed Peter and Paul and the other disciples, as disseminators of falsehood; and he accuses them of being rude and illiterate persons, because some of them had lived by fishing.”—“He affirms, that Christ was outlawed by the Jews; and that he afterwards collected a company of 900 banditti, and became a robber.”—“Also, wishing to overthrow his miracles, (which he does not pretend to deny,) he attempts to show, that Apollonius had performed as great, and even greater.”—“I do not say, (he adds,) that the reason why Apollonius was never accounted a god was, that he chose not to be so regarded: but I say that we are wiser—in not attaching at once the idea of divinity to the working of miracles—than you are, who believe a person a god, merely on account of a few wonderful acts.”—“Having poured out such crudities of his ignorance, and having laboured utterly to extirpate the truth, he has the temerity to entitle his nefarious books, which are hostile to God, (φιλανθεΐς,) devoted to the truth.”—Eusebius, *Liber contra Hieroclem*, Gr. and Lat., subjoined to his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, ed. Paris, 1628.—See Lardner’s Works, vol. viii. and Bayle, *Dictionnaire Histor. et Crit. art. Hierocles* (2nd). Tr.]

³ Lactantius, *Institut. Divinar. lib. v. c. 2.*

⁴ See Photius, *Biblioth. cod. clxv. p. 355.* [The works of Himerius are lost. Tr.]

⁵ [Libanius, the sophist, was born at Antioch about A.D. 314, and lived probably till about the end of the century.

He taught rhetoric and declamation at Nice, Nicomedia, Constantinople, Athens, and Antioch. His schools were large, sometimes amounting to more than 80 pupils; and rival sophists envied him. The emperor Julian, when young, was forbidden to attend the school of Libanius; but he obtained and read his writings, and made them his model as to style. When Julian came to the throne, he offered Libanius a public office, which the sophist proudly refused. Yet the emperor and he were very good friends. Libanius was an inflated, pedantic man, full of himself, yet independent in his feelings, and free in the expression of his opinions. He was an avowed pagan, yet a strenuous advocate for religious toleration. His numerous writings still remain, consisting of a prolix Life of himself, a large number of eulogies and declamations, and more than a 1000 letters. They seldom contain either profound or original thought, or display research: and the style is concise, affected, and pedantic. Yet they are of some use, to throw light on the times in which he lived. They were published, Gr. and Lat. vol. i. Paris, 1666, and vol. ii. by Morell, 1627, fol. The most complete edition of his Epistles, is by Wolf, Amsterdam, 1738, fol. A volume, containing 17 of his Declamations, was published at Venice, 1755.—See his *Life*, written by himself, in his Works, vol. ii. p. 1—34. Eunapius, *Vitæ Philos. et Sophistarum*, p. 130, &c., and among the moderns, Tillemont, *Histoire des Empereurs*, tom. iv. p. 571, &c. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* tom. vii. p. 376—414. Lardner, *Heathen Testimonies*, vol. iv. p. 127—163, and Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Rom. Emp.* ch. xxiv. Tr.]

⁶ [See Eunapius, *Lives of Aidesius, Maximus, &c.* Eunapius also wrote a chronicle, to which he frequently refers in his *Lives of the Sophists*, the first edition of which is full of reproaches against the Christians and Constantine

§ 18. How much harm was done to the Christian cause by these sophists or philosophers, inflated with a conceit of their own knowledge, and with hatred of the Christian name, appears from many examples in this century, and especially from *Julian*, who was seduced by such men. Among those who would pass for the wiser sort, desirous to avoid extremes, many were induced, by the arguments and explanations of these men, to devise a kind of intermediate religion, made up of the old superstition and Christianity, persuading themselves that it was the very thing enjoined by Christ, and that it had long been hidden by the pagan priests under the veil of ceremonies and fables. Of these views were *Ammianus Marcellinus*, a very prudent and discreet man⁷, *Chalcidius*, a philosopher⁸, *Themistius*, a very celebrated orator⁹, and others, who conceived that both religions were in unison, as to all the more important points, if they were rightly understood; and therefore held,

the Great; the second edition is more temperate. Both editions were extant in the times of Photius: see his *Biblioth. codex lxxvii. Schl.*

⁷ [*Ammianus Marcellinus*, a celebrated Latin historian, of Grecian extract, was a soldier, for at least twenty years, from A. D. 350 onwards, and served in the honourable corps called *Protectores Domestici*. On retiring from military life, he fixed his residence at Rome, where he lived perhaps till the end of the century. There it was he composed his faithful and valuable history. The work originally consisted of thirty-one books, and gave the Roman history from the accession of Nerva, (where Suetonius ends,) to the death of Valens. The first 13 books, which must have been very concise, are lost. The last 18, which are more full, include the period from A. D. 353—378. The style is harsh and unpolished, and sometimes difficult; but the fidelity and accuracy of the narration render the work highly valuable. *Marcellinus* was probably a real pagan; but he was not a bigot, and he was willing to give every one his due, according to his best judgment. The best editions of his work are, that of Vallesius, republished by Gronovius, Leyden, 1693, fol. and 4to, and that of Ernesti, Lips. 1775, 8vo. See Bayle, *Dictionnaire Histor. et Crit. art. Marcellin. Tr.*]

⁸ [*Chalcidius*, a philosopher of the fourth century, was author of a Latin

translation of the *Timæus* of Plato, and of a commentary on it, which were published by J. Meursius, Lugd. Bat. 1617, 4to. Dr. Mosheim's opinion of his religious faith is farther developed in his *Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesia*, § 31, and in his notes on Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, vol. i. p. 732, &c. J. A. Fabricius, (in his notes on *Chalcidius*, passim; and in his *Biblioth. Latina*, l. iii. c. 7, p. 557, &c.) and some others, hold that *Chalcidius* was a pagan.—Brucker (*Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. iii. p. 472, &c.) makes him a Christian, though infected with the new Platonism of his age. *Tr.*]

⁹ [*Themistius*, a Greek philosopher of Paphlagonia, called Euphrades, (the fine speaker,) from his eloquent and commanding delivery, was made a Roman senator, and enjoyed the favour of Constantius, Julian, and the succeeding emperors, down to Theodosius the Great, who made him prefect of Constantinople, and appointed him tutor to his son Arcadius. He wrote, when young, some commentaries on Aristotle, fragments of which are still extant, and 33 of his Orations. His works are best edited by Harduin, Paris, 1684, fol. He was a strenuous advocate for the free toleration of all religions, as being all good, and tending to the same result by different ways. Concerning him and his religious views, see Brucker's *Historia Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 484, &c. *Tr.*]

that *Christ* was neither to be contemned, nor to be honoured to the exclusion of the pagan deities ¹.

§ 19. As *Constantine* the Great, with his sons and successors, took much pains to enlarge the Christian church, it is not strange that many nations, before barbarous and uncivilized, became subject to *Christ* ². Many circumstances make it probable, that the light of Christianity cast some of its rays into both Armenias, the greater and the less, soon after the establishment of the Christian church ³. But the Armenian church first received due organization and firm establishment in this century; in the beginning of which, *Gregory*, the son of Anax, commonly called the *Illuminator*, because he dispelled the mists of superstition which beclouded the minds of the Armenians, first persuaded some private individuals, and afterwards *Tiridates*, the king of the Armenians, as well as his nobles, to embrace the Christian religion. He was, therefore, ordained the first bishop of Armenia, by *Leontius*, bishop of Cappadocia, and gradually diffused the principles of Christianity throughout that country ⁴.

§ 20. In the middle of this century, one *Frumentius* proceeded from Egypt into the neighbouring country of Abyssinia or Ethiopia, the inhabitants of which were called *Auxumitæ*, from their capital city *Auxuma*, and baptized both the king of the country, and very many of the nobles. Afterwards returning to Egypt, he was consecrated, by *St. Athanasius*, first bishop of the Auxumitæ. From this circumstance, the Ethiopic church, even to this day, is dependent on that of Alexandria,

¹ [This favourite opinion of Dr. Mosheim he defends more at length, in his *Diss. de turkata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesia*, § 30—32; among his *Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinentes*, vol. i. p. 85—216, Altonæ, 1733.—But it seems not necessary to adopt this hypothesis, which has but slender support from argument; because the Eclectic or new Platonic philosophy might easily lead its votaries to speak in terms of moderation, and even of commendation, of the Christian religion, especially in an age when it prevailed almost universally, and was the religion of the state and of the imperial court. *Tr.*]

² Gaudentius, *Vita Philastrii*, § iii. Philastrius, *de Hæres.* Pref. p. 5, ed. Fabricii. Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c.

19. Georgius Cedrenus, *Chronograph.* p. 234, ed. Paris; and others.

³ [For Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* l. vi. c. 46,) informs us that Dionysius of Alexandria, about the year 260, “wrote concerning penance, to the Brethren of Armenia, over whom Meruzanes was bishop;” and, according to the *Acta Martyrum*, some Armenians suffered martyrdom in the persecution under Decius, (A.D. 250;) and Diocletian, (A.D. 304.) *Tr.*]

⁴ See *Narratio de Rebus Armeniæ*, in Fr. Combefis, *Auctarian Biblioth. Patr. Græcor.* tom. ii. p. 287, &c. Mich. Le Quen, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 419 and 1356. J. J. Schröderi *Thesaur. Linguae Armenicæ*, p. 149, &c.

and receives its bishop from it⁵. In *Iberia*, a province of Asia which is now called *Georgia*, a Christian woman who had been carried captive into that country, partly by the sanctity of her life, and partly by miracles, induced the king and his queen to renounce idolatry and embrace *Christ*, and also to send for priests from Constantinople, from whom they and their people might gain a more accurate and full knowledge of the Christian religion⁶.

§ 21. A part of the *Goths*, inhabiting *Thrace*, *Mæsia*, and *Dacia*⁷, had embraced Christianity before the commencement of this century⁸; and *Theophilus* their bishop was present at the *Nicene council*⁹. *Constantine* the Great, after having vanquished them and the *Sarmatians*, engaged great numbers of them to become Christians¹. But still a large part of the nation remained estranged from *Christ*, until the times of the emperor *Valens*, who permitted them to pass the river *Ister*², and to inhabit *Dacia*, *Mæsia*, and *Thrace*, on condition that they would be subject to the Roman laws, and would embrace Christianity; to which condition their king *Fritigern* consented³. The bishop of the *Goths* inhabiting *Mæsia* in this century, was the much celebrated *Ulphilas*; who, among other laudable deeds, gave his countrymen an alphabet of his own invention, and translated the Bible for them into the Gothic language⁴.

⁵ Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium*, Opp. tom. i. pt. ii. p. 315, ed. Benedict. Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. i. c. 49. Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 24. Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 23. Job Ludolf, *Comment. ad Histor. Æthiop.* p. 281. Jerome Lobo, *Voyage d'Abissinie*, tom. ii. p. 13, &c. Justus Fontanius, *Historia Litterar. Aquilone*, p. 171.

⁶ Rufinus, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 10. Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 7. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1333, &c.

⁷ [Now the north-east part of Rumania, with Bulgaria and Wallachia, on the Danube. *Tr.*]

⁸ [Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 5. *Schl.*]

⁹ [Joh. Harduin, *Conciliorum* tom. i. p. 319. *Schl.*]

¹ Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 18.

² [Or Danube. *Tr.*]

³ Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 33. Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* tom. i. p. 1240. Eric Benzell, *Præf. ad IV. Evangelia Gothica*, (ascribed to Ulphilas,) c. v. p. xviii. &c. ed. Oxon. 1750, 4to.

⁴ Joh. Jac. Mascovii *Historia Germanor.* tom. i. p. 317, tom. ii. Note, p. 49. *Acta Sanctor.* March, vol. iii. p. 619. Eric Benzell, *loc. cit.* cap. viii. p. xxx. [J. C. Zahn, *Eindeitung in Ulphilas Bibelübersetzung*, p. 4, &c. ed. Weissentfels, 1805, 4to, where is condensed all that is stated of Ulphilas, and his translation, by the ancients, viz. Philostorgius, *H. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 5. Socrates, *H. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 41, and l. iv. c. 33. Sozomen, *H. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 24, l. vi. c. 37. Theodoret, *H. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 37, and others. Ulphilas (or *Ulfila*, *Urfilas*, *Gilfulas*, &c. but should, according to Jormanides, be written *Wulfila*, i. e. *Wölfein*, diminutive of *Wulf* or *Wolf*, a wolf,) is said, by Philostorgius, to have descended from Christian Greeks of Sadagoltina in Cappadocia, who were carried into captivity by the Goths in the year 266. Others suppose, from his name, that he was of Gothic extract. Philostorgius also makes him first bishop of the Goths, and says he was ordained by the Arian, Eusebius of Nicomedia, in the reign of Constan-

§ 22. In the European provinces of the Roman empire, there still remained a vast number of idolaters; and though the Christian bishops endeavoured to convert them to *Christ*, the business went on but slowly. In Gaul the great *Martin*, bishop of Tours, was not unsuccessful in this work; for travelling through the provinces of Gaul, he, by his discourses and by his miracles, (if we may believe *Sulpitius Severus*,) every where persuaded many to renounce their idols and embrace *Christ*; he destroyed also the temples, and threw down the statues of the gods⁵. He therefore merited the title of the *Apostle of the Gauls*.

§ 23. It is very evident that not only the victories of *Constantine* the Great, but also fear of punishment, and desire to please the Roman emperors, served for arguments with whole nations, as well as individuals, in embracing the Christian religion. Yet

time the Great. Others make him to have succeeded Theophilus, and to have flourished from the year 360 to 380. He was a man of talents and learning, an Arian, (at least in the latter part of his life,) and possessed vast and salutary influence among the Goths in Dacia, Mœsia, and Thrace. He was at the Arian synod of Constantinople, in the year 359; and was twice sent on embassies by the nation to the imperial court. His last embassy was in the reign of Valens, A.D. 376, to obtain permission for the Goths to pass the Danube and settle in Mœsia. He was successful; and 200,000 Goths were admitted into the Roman empire, on conditions of obeying the Roman laws and joining the Arian interest. It is not known when he died; but some time in the reign of Theodosius the Great (A.D. 379—395); he was succeeded in his episcopal office by Theotimus, or, as some report, by Selinas. He was author of a translation of the whole Bible, except the books of Kings, from Greek into the language of the Goths of Mœsia. The books of Kings were omitted by him, lest their history of wars and battles should inflame the already too great thirst of the Goths for war and carnage. The alphabet he used was of his own devising, and formed chiefly from the Greek and Latin. Nothing remains of this translation, except a single copy, somewhat mutilated, of the four Gospels, called the *Codex Argenteus*, because written in letters of silver, now at Upsal in Swe-

den; and a few fragments of the Epistle to the Romans, recovered from an erasure of a MS. of the 8th or 9th century. Ulphilas's Gospels were first published by Fr. Junius, Dort, 1665, 2 vols. 4to; afterwards at Stockholm, 1671, 4to; and very learnedly, Oxford, 1750, fol.; and lastly, in a very convenient German edition, by J. C. Zahn, Weissenfels, 1805, 4to, with a complete Apparatus in the German language. *Tr.*—Some farther fragments have been lately discovered among the *codices manuscripti* of Italy. *Ed.*

⁵ See Sulpitius Severus, Dial. i. de *Vita Martini*, c. 13. 15. 17. Dial. ii. p. 106, &c. ed. Hier. a Prato, Verona, 1741, fol.—[This Martin was born in Sabaria in Pannonia, and brought up at Pavia in Italy. He embraced Christianity contrary to the will of his parents; and served in the army, following the occupation of his father. He afterwards left the military life, and committed himself to the instruction of Hilary of Poitiers. From the Arians he suffered much persecution; and he was principally instrumental in the introduction of monasticism among the Gauls. [He was ordained Bishop of Tours, A.D. 374, and died in the year 397, aged 81.] For other particulars of his life, see his biographer, Sulpitius Severus; also Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise*, tome x.; and the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. i. pt. ii. p. 413. *Schl.*—The English reader may consult Milner's *Church History*, cent. iv. ch. 14. *Tr.*]

no person well informed in the history of this period, will ascribe the extension of Christianity wholly to these causes. For it is manifest, that the untiring zeal of the bishops and other holy men, the pure and devout lives which many of the Christians exhibited, the translations of the sacred volume, and the excellence of the Christian religion, were as efficient motives with many persons, as the arguments from worldly advantage and disadvantage were with some others. As for miracles, I cheerfully unite with those who look with contempt on the wonders ascribed to *Paul*, *Antony*, and *Martin*⁶. I also grant, that many events were inconsiderately regarded as miracles, which are according to the laws of nature; not to mention likewise pious frauds. Still I cannot join with such as believe, that in this age, God did never manifest his power by any extraordinary sign among Christians⁷.

§ 24. Although, from the time of *Constantine* the Great, no heavier calamity befel the Christian church within the Roman empire, than the commotion of *Licinius*, and *Julian's* brief reign, yet a slight storm sometimes beat upon it in particular places. *Athalaric*, for instance, king of the Goths, fiercely assailed for a time that portion of the Gothic nation which had embraced Christianity⁸. In the more remote provinces also, the adherents to idolatry often defended their hereditary superstitions with the sword, and murdered the Christians, who, in propagating their religion, were not always as gentle or as prudent as they ought to have been⁹. Beyond the limits of the Roman empire, *Sapor* II. surnamed *Longævus*, king of Persia, waged three bloody wars against the Christians in his

⁶ Hieron. a Prato, in his preface to Sulpitius Severus, p. xiii. &c. contends zealously for the miracles of Martin and the others in this century. [An account of the miracles of St. Martin may be found in Sulpit. Sever. *Vita Martini*; and *Epistles* i.—iii. and *Dialogues* ii. iii. The miracles of some contemporary monks of Egypt and the East, are the subject of dialogue i. For the history of Paul, see Jerome, *de Vita Sti Pauli Eremitæ*, in his *Opp.* tom. i. and for that of Antony, see Athanasius, *de Vita Sti Antonii Eremitæ*, in his *Opp.* tom. ii. ed. Paris, 1627. Tr.]

⁷ See Eusebius, *Liber contra Hieroclem*, c. iv. p. 431, ed. Olearii; Henr. Dodwell, *Diss. II. in Irenæum*, § iv. p. 195,

[also Dr. Conyers Middleton's *Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers which are said to have subsisted in the Christian Church*, &c. Lond. 1747, 4to; and in defence of miracles, Dr. Wm. Dodwell's *Answer to Dr. Middleton's Free Inquiry*, &c. 1751, 8vo, and Church's *Vindication of the Miraculous Powers, in answer to Middleton*, 1750, 8vo, likewise Dr. J. Jortin's *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i. ed. Lond. 1805. Tr.]

⁸ See Theod. Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum sincera*; and among these, the *Acta Sti Sabæ*, p. 598, &c.

⁹ See Ambrose, *de Officiis*, lib. i. c. xlii. § 17; where is a noticeable statement.

dominions. The *first* was in the eighteenth year of his reign¹; the *second* was in the thirtieth year; and the *third*, which was the most cruel, and destroyed an immense number of Christians, commenced in his thirty-first year, A.D. 330, and lasted forty years, or till A.D. 370. Yet religion was not the ostensible cause of this dreadful persecution, but a suspicion of treasonable practices among the Christians: for the Magi and the Jews persuaded the king, not only that all Christians wished well to the Roman empire, but also that *Symeon*, archbishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, sent to Constantinople intelligence of every thing that passed in Persia².

¹ [A.D. 317. *Tr.*]

² See Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ii. c. 1—13 [where is a full account]. These Persian persecutions are expressly treated of in the *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 6. 16. 181, and tom. iii. p. 52, &c. with which, however,

should be compared, Steph. Euod. Asseman, *Pref. ad Acta Martyrum Oriental. et Occidental.* splendidly edited, Rome, 1748, 2 vols. fol. p. lxxi. &c. He has published the *Martyrologium Persicum*, in Syriac, with a Latin translation, and excellent Notes.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. State of literature.—§ 2. Progress of the Platonic philosophy.—§ 3. Its fate.—
§ 4. State of learning among Christians.—§ 5. Many illiterate Christians.

§ 1. THOSE of this century, whether Greeks or Romans, who sought a character for scholarship, gave their attention to polite literature, eloquence in every branch, and history. Nor can a few be named of either nation, who from these studies gained applause. But all fell very short of the highest excellence. The best of these poets, as *Ausonius*¹, if compared with those of the Augustan age, appear harsh and inelegant. The rhetoricians, abandoning wholly the noble simplicity and majesty of the ancients, taught youth the art of deceiving people, by using tragic pomp on every occasion. Most of the historians, too, thought less of order, perspicuity, and truth, than of empty and tawdry ornaments.

§ 2. Nearly all who attempted philosophy in this century, were of the sect called Junior Platonists. It is not strange,

¹ [Decius, or Decimus, Magnus Ausonius, was a Latin poet, well born and educated at Bordeaux, who flourished in the last half of this century. He was probably a nominal Christian, was a man of poetic genius, and much caressed and advanced to high honours by those in authority. His poems were

chiefly short pieces, enlogies, epigrams, &c., and not devoid of merit. Yet the style attests the declining age of Roman literature. Some of the pieces are also very obscene. Edited by Tollius, Lugd. B. 1671, 4to; and Lat. and Fr. by Jaubert, Paris, 1769, 4 vols. 12mo. Tr.]

therefore, that Platonic notions constantly occur in the works of Christians, as they do in those of others. Yet there were fewer of these philosophers in the West than in the East. In Syria, *Jamblichus* of Chalcis expounded Plato, or rather made that philosopher's opinions bend to his own estimate of them². His writings show that he was superstitious, cloudy, credulous, and void of real sense. He was succeeded by *Ædesius*³, *Maximus*⁴, and others; of whose follies *Eunapius* gives us an account. In Egypt, *Hypatia*⁵, a distinguished lady, *Isidorus*⁶, *Olympiodorus*⁷, *Synesius*, a semi-Christian⁸, and others of less fame, propagated this kind of wisdom: why not call it folly?

§ 3. The emperor *Julian* being wonderfully fond of this philosophy, as his writings prove, a great many were led into

² [*Jamblichus*. There were three of this name; the first lived early in the second century; his works are now lost: the second probably died about the year 333, and wrote largely; the third was contemporary with Julian, and wrote the life of Alypius the musician. The second is the one intended by Dr. Mosheim. He was a pagan, an enthusiast, and a great pretender to superior talents and learning. Of his works there remain, a Life of Pythagoras, published Gr. and Lat. with notes by Kuster, Amstelod. 1707, 4to; Exhortation to the study of Philosophy; three books on mathematical learning; Commentary on Nicomachus; Institutes of Arithmetic; and a Treatise on the mysteries of the Egyptians and Chaldeans of Assyria; published Gr. and Lat. with notes, by Tho. Gale, Oxon. 1678, fol. See Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 260—270. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. iv. p. 282, &c., and Lardner's Works, vol. viii. Tr.]

³ [*Ædesius* of Cappadocia, a disciple of *Jamblichus*, and, like his master, a devotee of theurgy. See Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 270, &c. Tr.]

⁴ [*Maximus* of Ephesus, called the Cynic, another pretender to superhuman knowledge. He is said to have persuaded Julian to apostatize; and he certainly had great influence over that emperor. He was put to death, for practising magic, in the reign of Valens. See Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 281, &c. *Eunapius* (*de Vitis Sophistarum*) gives account of *Jamblichus*, *Ædesius*, and *Maximus*. Tr.]

⁵ [*Hypatia* of Alexandria, a lady who excelled all the philosophers of her age, and who publicly taught philosophy with great applause, flourished in the close of this century, and the first part of the next. She was murdered in a tumult, A. D. 415. See Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vii. c. 15. Suidas, art. *Hypatia*, tom. iii. p. 533. Tillemont, *Mémoires, &c. à l'Histoire Eccles.* tom. xiv. p. 274. Menage, *Hist. Mulier. Philosoph.* § 49, &c. p. 494, &c.; and Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 351. Tr.]

⁶ [*This Isidorus* was surnamed *Gazaens*, from Gaza in Palestine, the place of his birth. Concerning him, see Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 341, &c. *Schell*.]

⁷ [*Olympiodorus*, author of a Commentary upon Plato, still preserved in MS. at Paris; and a life of Plato, of which a Latin version has been published. There were several persons of this name. See Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 490. Tr.]

⁸ [*Synesius*, of Cyrene in Africa, studied upon *Hypatia*; resided at Constantinople from A. D. 397—400, as deputy from his native city; was made bishop of Ptolemais A. D. 410. He wrote well for that age; though he was too much infected with the reigning philosophy. His works, as edited by Petavius, Gr. and Lat. Paris, 1612, and 1631, fol., are—*De Regno, ad Arcadium Imperatorem*; *Dio, vel de ipsius ritæ instituto*; *Calceitæ enconium*; *Ægyptius, sive de Prociotia*; *de Insomniis*; *Epistole* elv.; and several Discourses and Hymns. Tr.]

vying with each other to dress it out with every art within their power⁹. But when *Julian* died, a dreadful storm burst upon the Platonists, during the reign of *Valentinian*; and several of them were arraigned and tried for their lives, on the charge of practising magic and other crimes. In these commotions, *Maximus*, the preceptor of *Julian*, among others, suffered death¹. But it was rather the intimacy of these men with *Julian*, whose counsellors they had been, than the philosophy to which they were addicted, that proved their ruin. Hence the rest of the sect, which had not been connected with the court, were exposed to very little danger or loss in this persecution of the philosophers.

§ 4. The Christians, from the times of *Constantine* the Great, devoted much more attention to the study of philosophy and the liberal arts, than they had done before; and the emperors omitted no means which might awaken and cherish a thirst for learning. Schools were established in many of the towns; libraries were formed, and literary men were encouraged by stipends, by privileges, and by honours². All this was required by the design which they had formed of gradually abolishing pagan idolatry; for the old heathen system derived its chief support from the learning of its advocates: and moreover, if Christian youths could not find instructors of their own belief, it must be feared that they would seek an education from pagan philosophers and rhetoricians which might cause injury to religious truth.

§ 5. It must not, however, be supposed, that the Christian church was full of literary, erudite, and philosophic men. For no law as yet kept an ignorant and uneducated person from sacred offices; and it appears, by unquestionable testimonies, that many, both bishops and presbyters, were entirely destitute of all science and learning. Besides, the party was both numerous and powerful, which considered all learning, but especially philosophical learning, as injurious, nay, even destructive to

⁹ See Ez. Spanheim, *Præfatio ad Opp. Juliani*, et ad versionem Gallicam *Cæsarium Juliani*, p. iii. et *Adnotat.* p. 234. Bletterie, *Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, liv. i. p. 26, &c.

¹ Ammianus Marcellin. *Histor. lib. xxix. c. 1*, p. 556, ed. Valesii; and Bletterie, *Vie de Julien*, p. 30, &c. 155,

159, &c.; and *Vie de Jorien*, tom. i. p. 194.

² See Ja. Godfrey, *ad Codicis Theodos. titulos de Professoribus et Artibus liberalibus*; Fran. Balduin, *Constantinus Magnus*, p. 122, &c. Herm. Conringius, *Diss. de studiis Romæ et Constantinop.* subjoined to his *Antiquitatt. Academicæ*.

true piety and religion. All the *ascetics*, *monks*, and *eremites*, were inclined towards this party; which was also highly favoured, not by women only, but by all besides who measured piety by gravity of countenance, sordidness of dress, and love of solitude, that is, by the many.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH, AND OF ITS TEACHERS.

§ 1, 2. Form of the Christian church.—§ 3. Conformed to the civil establishment.—§ 4. Administration, internal and external, of the church.—§ 5. Rank of the bishop of Rome.—§ 6. Limits of his jurisdiction.—§ 7. The bishop of Constantinople.—§ 8. Vices of the clergy.—§ 9. Distinguished writers in the Greek church.—§ 10. Principal writers in the Latin church.

§ 1. CONSTANTINE the Great left the old form of the Christian community untouched; yet, in some respects, he improved and extended it. While, therefore, he suffered the church to continue, as heretofore, a sort of distinct republic within the political body, he nevertheless assumed a supreme power over this sacred community, with such liberty of modelling and controlling it, as public good should need. Nor did any bishop call in question this power of the emperor. The people, therefore, in the same manner as before, freely chose their own bishops and teachers: and the bishops severally, in their respective districts or cities, directed and regulated all ecclesiastical affairs, using the presbyters as a council, and calling on the people for assent. The bishops also met together in conventions or councils, to deliberate on subjects in which the churches of a whole province were interested, on points of religious controversy, on the arrangement of divine worship, and other things. To these minor councils of one or more provinces, there were now added, assemblies or councils of the whole church. These, called *œcumenical* or *general councils*, met by authority from the emperor; who summoned the first of them at Nice. For he thought it just, (and in this he was

most likely guided by the judgment of the bishops,) that causes of great moment, and affecting the church universally or the general principles of Christianity, should be examined and decided in conventions of the whole church. There were never, indeed, any councils held, which could strictly and properly be called *universal*: those, however, whose decrees and enactments were received and approved by the whole church, or by the greatest part of it, are commonly called *ecumenical*.

§ 2. Upon established rights, however, great encroachments were gradually made from the time when various disturbances and quarrels and horrid contests every where arose, either on account of religious affairs or doctrines, or of episcopal elections. For appeals from the weaker parties to the court gave the emperors an excellent opportunity of imposing various restrictions on the power of the bishops, the people's liberty, and the ancient customs. The bishops, too, themselves, whose wealth and influence were not a little augmented from the times of *Constantine*, gradually subverted and changed the ancient principles of church government. For they first excluded the people altogether from a voice in ecclesiastical affairs, and next gradually deprived even the *presbyters* of their former authority, in order that they might do every thing at their discretion, and especially either draw the ecclesiastical property to themselves, or distribute it as they pleased. Hence, at the close of this century, only a slight shadow of the ancient church-government remained; that share of it, formerly vested in the presbyters and people, having passed chiefly to the bishops, the whole church's many shares to the emperors, or to their provincial governors and magistrates.

§ 3. *Constantine*, to render his throne secure and prevent civil wars, not only changed the system of Roman laws, but likewise, in many respects, the disposition of the commonwealth¹. And as he wished, for various reasons, the church to have a constitution like that now given to the state, it became necessary that new grades of honour should be introduced among the bishops. The chiefs of their body were those who had heretofore stood foremost in the prelacy, namely, the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria; with whom the bishop of Constantinople was joined, after the imperial

¹ See Bos, *Hist. de la Monarchie Française*, tom. i. p. 64. Giannone, *Hist. de Naples*, tom. i. p. 94. 152.

residence was transferred to that city. These four prelates answered to the four *praetorian praefects*, created by Constantine, and, perhaps even in this century, bore the Jewish title of *Patriarchs*. Next to these were the *exarchs*, corresponding with the civil *exarchs*, and presiding each over several provinces. The *metropolitans* came next, who governed only single provinces. After them ranked the *archbishops*, who had the inspection only of certain districts. The *bishops* brought up the rear; whose limits were not universally of the same extent, but in some provinces wider, in others narrower. To these I should add the *chorepiscopi*, or superintendents of country churches, did I not know that the bishops, eager to increase their own power, had caused this order to be suppressed in most places².

² This is shown by Ludov. Thomasinus, *Disciplina Eccles. vet. et nova circa beneficia*, tom. i. various passages. [Though the ecclesiastical divisions of the Roman empire did not coincide exactly with the civil divisions, yet a knowledge of the latter will help us to form a better idea of the former. Accordingly, we annex the following account of the civil distribution copied from an ancient *Notitia Imperii*, said to have been written before the reign of Arcadius and Honorius, or before A. D. 395. See Pagi, *Critica in Baronii Annot. ad ann. 37*, tom. i. p. 29, &c.

I. *Praefectus Praetorio Orientis*: et sub eo *Dioceses* quinque, ss.

1. *Diocesis orientis*, in qua *Provinciae* xv. nempe, *Palestina*, *Phoenice*, *Syria*, *Cilicia*, *Cyprus*, *Arabia*, *Isauria*, *Palestina Salutaris*, *Palestina II.* *Phoenice Libani*, *Euphratensis*, *Syria Salutaris*, *Osrhoëna*, *Mesopotamia*, et *Cilicia II.*

2. *Diocesis Aegypti*, in qua *Provinciae* vi. nempe, *Libya superior*, *Libya inferior*, *Thebais*, *Aegyptus*, *Arcadia*, et *Augustanica*.

3. *Diocesis Asiae*, in qua *Provinciae* x. nempe, *Pamphylia*, *Hellespontus*, *Lydia*, *Pisidia*, *Lyconia*, *Phrygia Pacatiana*, *Phrygia Salutaris*, *Lycia*, *Caria*, et *Insulae*.

4. *Diocesis Ponti*, in qua *Provinciae* x. nempe, *Galatia*, *Bithynia*, *Honorias*, *Cappadocia I.* *Paphlagonia*, *Pontus Polemoniacus*, *Hellespontus*, *Armenia I.* *Armenia II.* et *Galatia Salutaris*.

5. *Diocesis Thraciae*, in qua *Provinciae* vi. nempe, *Europa*, *Thracia*,

Haemimontis, *Rhodope*, *Moesia II.* et *Seythia*.

II. *Praefectus Praetorio Illyrici*: et sub eo *Dioceses* duae, ss.

1. *Diocesis Macedonica*, in qua *Provinciae* vi. nempe, *Achaia*, *Macedonia*, *Creta*, *Thessalia*, *Epirus vetus*, et *Epirus nova*.

2. *Diocesis Daciae*, in qua *Provinciae* v. nempe, *Dacia Mediterranea*, *Dacia Ripensis*, *Moesia prima*, *Dardania Praevalitiana*, et *Pars Macedonica Salutaris*.

III. *Praefectus Praetorio Italiae*: et sub eo *Dioceses* tres, ss.

1. *Diocesis Italiae*, in qua *Provinciae* xvii. nempe, *Venetica*, *Emilia*, *Liguria*, *Flaminia* et *Picenum Annonarium*, *Tuscia* et *Umbria*, *Picenum Suburbicarium*, *Campania*, *Sicilia*, *Apulia* et *Calabria*, *Lucania* et *Bruttii*, *Alpes Cottiae*, *Rhaetia prima*, *Rhaetia secunda*, *Samnium*, *Valeria*, *Sardinia*, et *Corsica*.

2. *Diocesis Illyrici*, in qua *Provinciae* vi. nempe, *Pannonia secunda*, *Savia*, *Dalmatia*, *Pannonia prima*, *Noricum Mediterraneum*, et *Noricum Ripense*.

3. *Diocesis Africae*, in qua *Provinciae* vii. nempe, *Byzacium*, *Numidia*, *Mauritania*, *Sitifensis*, *Mauritania Caesariensis*, *Tripolis*, et *Africa Praeconsularis*.

IV. *Praefectus Praetorio Galliarum*: et sub eo *Dioceses* tres; ss.

1. *Diocesis Hispaniae*, in qua *Provinciae* vii. nempe, *Baetica*, *Lusitania*, *Gallaecia*, *Tarraconensis*, *Carthaginensis*, *Tingitania*, et *Balearae*.

2. *Diocesis Galliarum*, in qua *Provinciae* xvii. nempe, *Viennensis*, *Lugdunensis I.* *Germania I.* *Germania II.* *Belgica I.* *Belgica II.* *Alpes Maritimae*, *Alpes*

§ 4. The administration of ecclesiastical affairs was divided

Pennina et Graie, Maxima Sequanorum, Aquitania I. Aquitania II. Novempopuli, Narbonensis I. Narbonensis II. Lugdunensis II. Lugdunensis III. et Lugdunensis Senonia.

3. Diocesis Britanniarum, in qua Provincie v. nempe, Maxima Caesariensis, Valentia, Britannia I. Britannia II. et Flavia Caesariensis.

Thus the *civil* division of the Roman empire was, in this century, divided into 4 Prefectures, containing 13 Dioceses, which embraced 116 Provinces. The *ecclesiastical* division of the empire, though founded upon the civil division, was by no means so complete and so regular. The *civil provinces* were generally *ecclesiastical provinces*, and under the inspection severally of the *metropolitans*, or *archbishops* of these provinces. Yet there were many *bishops* who were exempt from the inspection or jurisdiction of the metropolitans, and were therefore called *ἀποκρίτατοι*, *independent*. They also bore the titles of *archbishops* and of *metropolitans*, although they had no suffragans, or bishops depending on them. Above the rank of metropolitans, there were properly none other than the *patriarchs*. For the *churches* of Asia, Cappadocia, and Pontus, were only the *first metropolitans* of those civil dioceses, while they belonged to no patriarchate. And the *primates* of certain countries, in after-ages, were only the metropolitans that ranked first, or had precedence, among the metropolitans of their respective countries.—Hence there were not properly *five* orders of bishops, above the rank of chorepiscopi, as Dr. Mosheim represents; but only three, namely, *patriarchs*, *metropolitans*, or *archbishops*, and simple *bishops*.—Before the times of Constantine, provincial councils were common; and these gave rise to the order of *metropolitans*. Among the metropolitans, those of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, stood pre-eminent in honour and influence. During the reign of Constantine the Great, the powers of these three *metropolitans* were enlarged; but whether they bore the title, or possessed the authority, of *patriarchs*, at that time, is not certain. They however became *patriarchs*, both in name and in power, before the century had elapsed. And these were the three original patriarchs. Towards the close of this century, the bishops of Constan-

tinople obtained rank next to those of Rome, and extended their authority over several dioceses not subject to the other patriarchs. In the next century, the bishops of Jerusalem became independent of the patriarchs of Antioch; and thus there were *five* patriarchates formed. Their respective limits were as follows. The patriarchal authority of the bishops of Rome did not at first extend beyond Italy, perhaps not over the whole of that. For the bishops of Africa, Spain, Gaul, Britain, and Illyricum, acknowledged no ecclesiastical head or ruler, except their own metropolitans. But after the dissolution of the western empire, the bishop of Rome found means to bring all the bishops and metropolitans of the West under his authority. This he justified, partly by claiming to be patriarch of all the West, and partly by virtue of his assumed supremacy over the whole church. The patriarchs of Constantinople claimed dominion over the civil dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, which belonged to the prefecture of the East, and also over the two dioceses composing the prefecture of Illyricum.* No one of these dioceses had before belonged to any patriarchate; the three former having been governed by provincial councils, in which the metropolitans of Ephesus, Caesarea in Cappadocia, and Heraclea in Thrace, had the precedence of all other metropolitans. The two other dioceses, those of Macedonia and Dacia, had been governed in a similar manner; and being afterwards claimed by the bishops of Rome, were the cause of long and violent contests between these ambitious prelates. But the patriarchs of Constantinople retained them, and thereby extended their dominions northward over the Russian empire. The patriarchate of Antioch embraced, originally, the whole diocese of the East, and likewise extended over the churches beyond the limits of the Roman empire in Asia, quite to India. But in the year 451, the patriarchate of Jerusalem was created out of it, embracing the whole of Palestina I. II. and III. or Salutaris, and thence to Mount Sinai and the borders of Egypt. The patriarchate of Alexandria embraced the civil diocese of Egypt; and thence extended into Abyssinia.—Such were the territorial limits of the five patriarchates, from

by *Constantine* himself into the *external* and the *internal*³. The latter he relinquished to the bishops and to councils. It embraced all the essentials of religion, religious controversies, forms of worship, functions of the priests, their vices, and some other things. The *external* administration he took upon himself. It included whatever relates to the external condition of the church, or to its discipline, and also all contests and causes of the ministers of the church, both of the higher and of the lower orders, which did not respect religion and sacred functions, but property, worldly honours, and privileges, offences against the laws, and the like⁴. He therefore, and his successors, assembled councils, presided in them, assigned judges for religious disputes, decided contests between bishops and their people, determined the limits of ecclesiastical provinces, and by the ordinary judges, heard and decided upon the civil causes and common offences among the ministers of the church; ecclesiastical causes, on the other hand, he left to the cognizance of councils and bishops. Yet this famous partition of the ecclesiastical government into the *external* and the *internal* administrations, was never clearly explained and accurately defined. Hence, both in this and in the follow-

the fifth century, onward to the Reformation. In the eleventh century, Nilus Doxopatrius, of Constantinople, gives them substantially the same boundaries. From him we learn, that the patriarch of Constantinople then presided over 52 metropolitans, who had under them 649 suffragan bishops; and over 13 titular metropolitans, *i. e.* bishops who were called metropolitans and *αὐτοκέφαλοι*, but had no suffragans; and likewise 34 titular archbishops. The patriarch of Antioch presided over 13 metropolitans, with 139 suffragans, besides 8 titular metropolitans, and 13 titular archbishops. The patriarch of Jerusalem presided over 4 metropolitans with suffragans, and 25 titular archbishops. And the patriarch of Alexandria presided over 7 metropolitans with suffragans, and 5 titular metropolitans and archbishops. The number of suffragans in the two last patriarchates is not given. *Tr.*—"The first time we meet with the name *Patriarch*, given to any bishop by any public authority of the church, is in the council of Chalcedon, which mentions the most holy patriarchs of every diocese, and particularly Leo,

patriarch of Great Rome. Richerius, who has written accurately about the councils, can trace the name no higher. Among private authors, the first that mentions patriarchs by name is Socrates, who wrote his history about the year 440, eleven years before the council of Chalcedon." Bingham's *Antiquities*, i. 67. See that admirable work for information upon this matter; also Cave's *Dissertation concerning the government of the Ancient Church*, Lond. 1683. Edw. Brevewood, *Veteris Ecclesie Gubernatio Patriarchalis*. *Ed.*]

³ Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini Magni*. lib. iv. c. 24.

⁴ See the imperial laws, in both the Justinian and Theodosian Codex; and, among others, Ja. Godfrey, *ad Codicem Theodos.* tom. vi. p. 55, 56, 333, &c. [This whole system resulted, in part, from the office of Pontifex Maximus, which was retained by Constantine and all his successors, till into the fifth century; and, in part, from the conception of Constantine, that the church was a society existing independently of the state. See Boss, *Diss. de Pontificatu maximo Imperator. Christianor.* Schl.]

ing centuries, we see many transactions which do not accord with it but contravene it. For the emperors not unfrequently determined religious matters of the interior kind: and, in like manner, councils and bishops often enacted laws respecting things which seem to belong to the external form and affairs of the church.

§ 5. The bishop of Rome took precedence over all others of the episcopal order. Nor was this pre-eminence founded solely on popular feeling and a prejudice of long standing, sprung from various causes: but also on those grounds which commonly give priority and greatness in the estimation of mortals. For he exceeded all other bishops in the amplitude and splendour of the church over which he presided, in the magnitude of his revenues and possessions, in the number of his ministers of various descriptions, in the weight of his influence with the people at large, and in the sumptuousness and magnificence of his style of living⁵. These marks of power and worldly greatness were so fascinating to the minds of Christians even in this age, that often most obstinate and bloody contests took place at Rome when a new pontiff was to be created by the suffrages of the priests and people. A shocking example of this is afforded by the disturbance at Rome in the year 366, after the death of *Liberius*. When they came to the choice of a new bishop, one party was for placing *Damasus*, and another for appointing *Ursicinus*, a deacon, over the widowed church; and the contention caused a cruel war, great loss of life, conflagrations, and battles. *Damasus* came off victorious in the contest; but whether his claims were better, or his cause more righteous, than those of *Ursicinus*, does not appear⁶. I dare not pronounce either of them a good man.

⁵ Ammianus Marcellinus, *Hist.* l. xxvii. c. 3. ["Besides their standing rents and revenues, their gains by collections and oblations were so great, that by them alone, in the time of pope Damasus, they were enabled to live in a state and grandeur like that of temporal princes, if we may believe the account given by Ammianus Marcellinus: and the story is known of Prætextatus, a zealous Gentile, designed to be consul, who, reflecting upon the plenty of that see, was wont pleasantly to tell pope

Damasus, make me but bishop of Rome, and I will immediately become a Christian." Cave's *Disc. of the Anc. Ch. Gov.* p. 25. *Ibid.*]

⁶ See the writers of Lives of the Popes, among whom Arch. Bower has stated this matter ingeniously and impartially, in his *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. i. p. 180, &c. ed. 2, Lond. 1749. [Ammian. Marcellin. *Hist.* l. xxvii. c. 3, says, that 137 corpses of the slain were found in one day in the church of Sicinius. *Tr.*]

§ 6. It is, however, abundantly attested, that the bishops of Rome did not in this age possess supreme power and jurisdiction in the church. They were citizens of the commonwealth; and though higher in honour, they obeyed the laws and mandates of the emperors, just like other citizens. The more weighty religious causes were determined either by judges appointed by the emperor, or in councils; minor causes were decided by individual bishops. The laws relating to religion were enacted either by the emperors or by councils. No one of the bishops acknowledged that his authority was derived from the plenary power of the Roman bishop, or that he was constituted a bishop *by the favour of the apostolic see*. On the contrary, they all maintained that they were the ambassadors and ministers of *Jesus Christ*, and that their authority was derived from above⁷. Yet it is undeniable, that even in this age, several of those steps were laid, by which the Roman pontiffs afterwards mounted to the summit of ecclesiastical dominion; and this, partly by the imprudence of the emperors, partly by the sagacity of the pontiffs themselves, and partly by the hasty decision of certain bishops. Among these steps, however, I would assign either no place, or only the very last, to the *fourth canon* of the council of *Sardica*, in the year 347, to which the friends of the Roman pontiff assign the *first* and the most important place. For, not to mention that the authority and regularity of this council are very dubious, and that, not without reason, the enactments of this council are regarded by some as coming to us corrupted, and by others as forged⁸; it cannot be made to appear from that canon, that the

⁷ All these points are discussed at large by many writers, among whom I will name Peter de Marca, de *Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*; L. E. Dupin, de *Antiqua Ecclesie Disciplina*; and especially, Dav. Blondell, de la *Primauté dans l'Eglise*,—a very learned work: [also Fred. Spanheim, *Diss. de Primatu Papæ, et Canonæ vi. Nicæni*. Schl.—The sixth canon of the council of Nice, A. D. 325, gave to the bishops of Alexandria, Rome, and Antioch, severally, the same pre-eminence over their respective surrounding bishops. Meletius had encroached upon the prerogatives of his metropolitan of Alexandria; and therefore the council ordain, (according to the translation of Dionysius Exiguus,) ANTI-

QUA CONSUETUDO SERVETUR *per Egyptum, Libyam, et Pontapolim, ita ut Alexandrinus Episcopus horum omnium habeat potestatem; quia et Romæ Episcopo parilis mos est. Similiter autem et apud Antiochiam, cæterisque provinciis, suis privilegia serventur ecclesiis.* To reconcile this canon with the papal claims of universal empire, the Romanists tell us, it relates merely to the patriarchal or metropolitan power of the bishop of Rome, and not to his power as *pope*:—a distinction which does not appear to have occurred to the Nicene fathers. See Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccles. cent. iv. diss. xx. Tr.*—See also Cave, *Diss. of the Anc. Ch. Gov.* p. 56. *Ed.*]

⁸ See Mich. Geddes, *Diss. de Canon-*

bishops assembled at Sardica decided, that in all cases an appeal might be made to the Roman pontiff as the supreme and final judge. But suppose they had so decided, which yet can never be proved, how weak must that right be which is founded only on the decision of a single obscure council⁹.

§ 7. *Constantine* the Great, by transferring the imperial residence to Byzantium, and there founding the new city of Constantinople, undesignedly raised up against the rising power of the Roman pontiff a powerful competitor in the bishop of the new metropolis. For as the emperor wished his *Constantinople* to be another or a *new Rome*, and had endowed it with all the privileges, decorations, and honours of old Rome, the bishop of so great a city, the imperial residence besides, also wished to be thought every way equal to the bishop of old Rome in rank, and to have precedence of all other bishops. Nor did the emperors disapprove of this ambition, because they considered their own dignity as involved in that of the bishop of their metropolis. Therefore in the council of Constantinople, assembled in the year 381, by authority of the emperor *Theodosius* the Great, the bishop of Alexandria not being present, and the bishop of Rome being opposed to it, the bishop of Constantinople was, by the third canon, placed in the first rank after the bishop of Rome; the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, of course, to take rank after him. The bishop who had this honour conferred on him was *Nectarius*.

bus Sardicensibus; among his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. ii. p. 415; [and Arch. Bower, *Lives of the Popes*,—Pope Julian, vol. i. p. 420, &c. ed. 2, Lond. 1749, 4to. Tr.]

⁹ [This council was got up by Julius, bishop of Rome; and was designed to be a general council, and was therefore held at Sardica in Illyrium, as accommodating both the East and the West; but as most of the eastern bishops withdrew from it, it was rather a council of the West. Its decrees were not confirmed by several subsequent councils, nor received by the whole church. See de Marca, *de Concordia Sacrorum*, &c. lib. vii. ch. 4, 5, 11, 12, 15. By the third canon in the Greek, or the fourth in the Latin translation by Isidorus, it was ordered, that if any bishop shall think himself unjustly condemned, and wish for a new trial, his judges shall

acquaint the bishop of Rome therewith, who may either confirm the first judgment, or order a new trial before such of the neighbouring bishops as he may choose to name. The fourth canon, according to the Greek, adds, that the see of the deposed bishop shall remain vacant, till the determination of the bishop of Rome is known. By the fifth canon, according to the Greek, and the seventh of Isidorus, it is ordered, that if a condemned bishop apply to Rome for relief, the bishop of Rome may, if he see fit, not only order a new trial, but if the aggrieved bishop desire it, he may send one of his presbyters to sit and have a voice in the second trial. See de Marca, *loc. cit.* cap. 3.—Thus these canons do not give the bishop of Rome even an *appellate jurisdiction*, but only the power to decide whether an injured bishop shall have a *new trial*. Tr.]

His successor, *John Chrysostom*, went further, and subjected all Thrace, Asia¹, and Pontus, to his jurisdiction². The subsequent bishops of Constantinople gradually advanced their claims still further. But this revolution in the ecclesiastical government, and the sudden elevation of the Byzantine bishop to high rank, to the injury of others, in the first place fired the Alexandrine prelates with resentment against those of Constantinople; and in the next place, gave rise to those unhappy contests between the pontiffs of old and new Rome, which were protracted through several centuries, with various success, and finally produced a separation between the Latin and the Greek churches.

§ 8. The vices of the clergy, especially of those who officiated in large and opulent cities, were augmented in proportion to the increase of their wealth, honours, and advantages, derived from the emperors and from numberless other sources: and that this increase was very great, after the times of *Constantine*, is acknowledged by all. The *bishops* had shameful quarrels among themselves, respecting the extent of their jurisdiction and boundaries; and while they trampled on the rights of the people and of the inferior clergy, they vied with the civil governors of provinces in luxury, arrogance, and voluptuousness³. The *presbyters*, in many places, assumed an equality with bishops, in rank and authority. Of the pride and effeminacy of the deacons, we often meet with various complaints. Those especially who ranked first among the presbyters and deacons, were unwilling to be considered as belonging to the same order with the others; and, therefore, they not only assumed the titles of *archpresbyters* and *archdeacons*, but they thought themselves authorized to assume far greater liberties than were allowed to others.

¹ [The diocese of the western part of Asia Minor. *Tr.*]

² See Peter de Marca, *Diss. de Constantinop. Patriarchatus Institutione*; annexed to his work, *de Concordiâ Sacerdotii et Imperii*, vol. iv. p. 163, &c. ed. Bamh. 1789. Mich. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 15, &c. Sam. Parker, *An Account of the Government of the Christian Church for the first six hundred years*, p. 245, Lond. 1683, 8vo.

[The canon of the council was thus expressed: "Constantinopolitane civitatis

Episcopum habere oportet primatûs honorem post Romanum Episcopum, propterea quòd sit nova Roma." *Tr.*]

³ See Sulpitius Severus, *Historia Sacra*, lib. i. c. 23, lib. ii. c. 32. 51. *Dialog.* i. c. 21. Add to this, the account given by Dav. Clarkson, in his *Discourse on Liturgies*, p. 228, (of the French edition,) of the extremely corrupt state of morals among the clergy; and, in particular, of the eagerness of the bishops to extend the boundaries of their authority, p. 150, &c.

§ 9. Among the more celebrated writers of this age, who shed lustre on the eastern provinces and Greece, the most eminent were those whose names here follow. *Eusebius Pamphili*⁴, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, a man of great reading and erudition, who has acquired immortal fame by his labours in ecclesiastical history, and in other branches of theological learning. Yet he was not free from errors and defects; leaning towards the side of those who hold an inequality between the three persons in the Godhead. Some rank him among the *Arians*; but they certainly err in so doing, if they intend by an *Arian*, one who embraces the opinions taught by *Arius* the presbyter of Alexandria⁵. *Peter*, bishop of Alexandria, who is

⁴ [So called from his close intimacy with the martyr, Pamphilus, who has sometimes been inaccurately represented as his brother. Mosheim styles him *Eusebius Pamphili*, as does Cave, but Du Pin, *Eusebius Pamphilus*. He requires either one of these distinctions, or to be mentioned with his see of *Caesarea*, to prevent confusion with Eusebius of Nicomedia, Eusebius of Emesa, and others of the same name. *Et.*]

⁵ No one has, with more zeal and learning, accused Eusebius of Arianism, than Joh. le Clerc, in his *Epistola Ecclesiast.* annexed to his *Ars Critica*, ep. ii. p. 30, &c. To him, add Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccles. Nov. Test.* sec. iv. diss. xvii. All, however, that these and others labour to prove is, that Eusebius thought that there was some disparity and a subordination among the persons of the Godhead. And suppose this to have been his opinion, it will not follow that he was an *Arian*, unless the term be taken in a very extensive and improper sense. It is to be lamented that so many abuse this term, and apply it to persons who, though in error, are very far from holding the opinions of Arius. [Eusebius Pamphili (ss. *amicus*, φίλος,) was born, probably, about the year 270, and at Caesarea, where he spent nearly all his life. Till about 40 years of age, he lived in great intimacy with the martyr Pamphilus, a learned and devout man of Caesarea, and founder of an extensive library there, from which Eusebius derived his vast stores of learning. Pamphilus was two years in prison, during which Eusebius was constantly with him. After the martyrdom of his friend, in the year 309, Eusebius fled

first to Tyre, and thence to Egypt, where he lived till the persecution subsided. After his return to Caesarea, about the year 314, he was made bishop of his own city. In the year 325, he attended the council of Nice, was appointed to deliver the address to the emperor on his entering the council, and then to be seated at his right hand. The first draft of the Nicene creed was made by him; to which, however, the term *ὁμοούσιον* and the *anathemas* were added by the council, and not without some scruples on the part of Eusebius. Afterwards Eusebius appeared to belong to a moderate party, who could not go all lengths with either side. About the year 330, he was offered the patriarchal chair of Antioch, which he refused; because the ancient customs forbid the removal of bishops from one see to another. He died about the year 340. The opinion advanced by Dr. Mosheim, respecting the Arianism of Eusebius, is supported at length by Soerates, among the ancients, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 21; and by W. Cave, in his *Diss. de Eusebio Caesariensi Arianismo*, ad c. Joh. Clericum; and in his *Epistola Apologet. ad eundem*; both are annexed to his *Historia Literar. Scriptor. Ecclesiast.*—Of the numerous works of Eusebius, the following have been preserved.

1. *Chronicon*, originally in two parts; the *first*, a brief history of the origin and revolutions of all nations; and the *second*, a full chronological table of the same events. Little of the original Greek remains; but we have the Latin translation of the *second* part by Jerome; which, with what could be gleaned of the Greek, and considerable additions from other ancient chronicles, was published

highly extolled by *Eusebius*°. *Athanasias*, bishop of Alexan-

by Jos. Scaliger, 1606, fol. and a 2nd ed. by Morus, 1638.

2. *Preparatio Evangelica*, in fifteen books; intended to *prepare* the minds of pagans to embrace Christianity, by showing, that the pagan religions are absurd, and far less worthy to be received than the Christian. It is a learned and valuable work; published Gr. and Lat. by E. Vigerus, Paris, 1628, fol., and again, Cologne, (Leipsic) 1688.

3. *Demonstratio Evangelica*, in twenty books, of which the last ten are lost. This is an attempt to *demonstrate* the truth of the Christian religion, by arguments drawn from the Old Test., and was, therefore, intended especially for the Jews. It is far less valuable than the former. Ed. Paris, 1628, and Cologne, 1688, fol.

4. *Contra Hieroclem Liber*; in defence of Christianity, against the attack of that pagan philosopher. See the article *Hierocles*, supra, p. 301, note 2. It is published Gr. and Lat. annexed to the *Demonstratio Evangelica*, and by Godf. Olcarius, with the works of the two Philostratus', Lips. 1709, fol.

5. *Historia Ecclesiastica*, in ten books, from the birth of Christ to the death of Licinius in 324: a most valuable treasure, though less full and complete than could be wished. Eusebius was an impartial historian, and had access to the best helps for composing a correct history which his age afforded. See Ch. Aug. Kestner, *Commentatio de Eusebii Historiæ Eccles. conditoris Auctoritate et Fide diplomatica, sive de ejus Fontibus et Ratione, qua eis usus est*; Gotting. 1816, 4to. This work, with the three following, was best edited, Gr. and Lat. by Valsius, Paris, 1659 and 1671. Amsterd. 1695, and with improvements by W. Reading, Cambridge, 1720, 3 vols. fol.—including the other Gr. Ecclesiastical historians; namely, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Evagrius, Theodorus Lecter, and Philostorgius. Those of Euseb. Socrat. Sozom. and Evag. with the three following works, were translated into English, Cambr. 1683, 1 vol. fol.

6. *De Martyribus Palestine Liber*; usually appended to the eighth book of his *Hist. Eccles.* It gives account of the sufferers in the East and in Egypt, during the persecution of Diocletian, or A.D. 303—313.

7. *De Vita Constantini Magni*, libri iv.; a panegyric, rather than a biography.

8. *Oratio de Laudibus Constantini*; delivered on the emperor's *vicennalia*, A.D. 335.

9. *Contra Marcellum*, libri ii.; composed by order of the council of Constantinople, 336, by which Marcellus was condemned as a Sabellian; annexed, Gr. and Lat. to the Paris edition of the *Præp. Evang.* 1628.

10. *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, libri iii. This also is in confutation of Marcellus' opinions; and is printed, with the former, Gr. and Lat. subjoined to the *Præp. Evang.*

11. *De Locis Hebraicis*; a kind of Biblical Gazetteer of Palestine; edited with the Latin translation of Jerome, by Bonfrerius, Paris, 1631.

12. *Expositio in Cantica Anticorum*, ed. by Meursius, Leyden, 1617, 4to.

13. *Vitæ Prophetarum*, ascribed to Euseb. Gr. and Lat. Paris, 1580, fol. with the Comment of Procopius in Isaiam.

14. *Canones sacrorum Evangeliorum*; tables, showing what portions of the Gospel History are narrated by one, by two, by three, or by four Evangelists. The Latin translation of Jerome was published in the *Orthodoxographia*, in the Works of Jerome, and in *Biblioth. Patrum*.

15. *Apologia pro Origene Liber primus*; (the other five books are wholly lost;) the Latin translation of this, by Rufinus, is published among the works of Jerome.

16. *Commentarii in Psalmos CL.* (but all beyond Ps. 119, is lost,) published Gr. and Lat. by Montfaucon, *Collect. Nœ. Gr. Patrum*, tom. i. Paris, 1706, fol.

17. *Commentarii in Isaiam*; ed. Gr. and Lat. by Montfaucon, *ubi supra*, tom. ii.

18. *Fourteen Latin Essays, or Discourses against Sabellianism, &c.* were published by Simmond, Paris, 1643, 8vo, under the dubious title of *Eusebii Casariensis Opuscula* xiv.

19. *Eclogarum prophetiarum de Christo libri iv.* (a collection and explanation of the Old Test. prophecies concerning Christ,) is said to exist in MS. in the Bibliotheca Viennensis.

20. *Epistola ad Casarienses*; a letter to his own church concerning the

dria, famous, among other writings and acts, for his very strenuous opposition to the Arians⁷. Basil, surnamed the Great,

Nicene creed; extant, Gr. and Lat. in Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 8. Theod. *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 12, et inter *Opera Athanasii*, tom. i. p. 238, ed. Paris.

Eusebius wrote many other works which have not reached us: namely, *de Præparatione Ecclesiastica Libri aliquot*; *de Demonstratione Ecclesiast. — contra Porphyrium*, libri xxv.; *de Evangeliorum Dissonantia*; *περί Ομοφασίας*, libri v.; *Comment. in I. Epist. ad Corinth.*—*περί τῶν ὁμοῦ λόγων* Liber primus (the first part of No. 11); *de Vita Pamphili*, libri iii.; *Confutationis et Apologie libri ii.* (probably, a defence of himself against the charge of Arianism;) *Antiquorum Martyriorum Collectio* (said to be in eleven books); *Acta Martyrii Scti Luciani*; *Descriptio Basilice Hierosolym.*—*de Festo Paschali Liber*; *Epistola ad Constantiam de Imagine Christi*; *Epistola ad Alexandrum Ep. Alex. de Ario*; *Epistola ad Euphrasium*, (extracts from these three Epistles are found in the *Acta Concilii Niceni II.* Actione 6ta.) *Tr.*]

⁶ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ix. c. 6. [Peter succeeded Thomas in the see of Alexandria, in the year 300; was imprisoned in the year 303, and whether released or not, before his martyrdom, in 311, is uncertain. He is represented as a very learned, pious, and active bishop. Of his writings, nothing remains but some rules respecting penance, and other points of ecclesiastical discipline, to be found in the collections of the ancient canons and decrees of councils. *Tr.*]

⁷ The accounts given of Athanasius by the oriental writers, are collected by Euseb. Renaudot, in his *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinorum*, p. 33. All the works of Athanasius were splendidly published in three volumes, folio, by the Benedictine monk, Bernh. de Montfaucon.—[Athanasius was born at Alexandria about the year 298. He had a good education, and early displayed great strength of mind, and uncommon sagacity as a disputant, and a man of business. He was ordained a deacon in 319, and became the confidant and chief counsellor of his bishop Alexander, whom he accompanied to the council of Nice in 325. In that council he was very active, and acquired great reputation. In the year 326, Alexander died, and,

at his recommendation, Athanasius succeeded to the see of Alexandria, when only 27 or 28 years old. For half a century he was the head of the orthodox party in the Arian controversy. This rendered him extremely odious to the Arians, and involved him in controversy and sufferings nearly all his life. False accusations were raised against him; and a council was held at Cæsarea, A.D. 334, before which he was summoned, but would not appear. The next year, by peremptory command of the emperor Constantine, he appeared before the council of Tyre, and answered to the charges of murder, unchastity, necromancy, encouraging sedition, oppressive exactions of money, and misuse of church property. Though his defence was good, he could not obtain justice; and he therefore fled to Constantinople, imploring the protection of the emperor. Here a council was assembled in 336, and a new charge falsely preferred against him, namely, that he prevented the shipments of corn from Alexandria to Constantinople. He was unjustly condemned, and banished to Treves in Belgium. Arius died that year, and Constantine the Great the year following. In the year 338, the sons of Constantine allowed Athanasius to return to Alexandria. He immediately began to displace Arians, and to recall the churches to the faith. Disturbances ensued; Athanasius was again accused, and made application to the bp. of Rome for aid. In 341, the council of Antioch decreed that no bishop, who had been deposed by a council, ought ever to return to his see; and on this ground, the see of Alexandria was declared vacant, and one Gregory of Cappadocia appointed to it. Gregory took forcible possession of it, and Athanasius fled to Rome for protection. A provincial council held there acquitted him on all the charges of his adversaries; and three years after, A.D. 344, a much larger council, held at Sardica, did the same. In 347, after an exile of seven or eight years, Athanasius was permitted, by the Arian emperor Constantius, to return to his see. But in 350, on the death of Constans, he was again accused and persecuted. Constantius caused him to be condemned in a council at

bishop of Cæsarea⁸, who was inferior to few of his time, in felicity of genius, skill in debate, and eloquence⁹. *Cyril*, bishop

Arles in 354, and at the council of Milan in 355. Athanasius concealed himself at Alexandria two years, and then retired among the hermits of Egypt till the death of Constantius in 361. In this retirement he wrote most of his best works. On the accession of Julian, in 361, he returned to his flock. But two years after, the pagans joining the Arians, induced Julian to banish him again. But Julian died the same year, and Athanasius returned immediately to his see. In the year 367, the Arian emperor Valens made some attempts to remove him, but without success. He died a. d. 373, aged about 75, having been a bishop 46 years. He was truly a great man, a good bishop, and a most able, persevering, and successful defender of the orthodox faith, in respect to the Trinity. His works are chiefly controversial, and in relation to that one doctrine. They consist of numerous letters and tracts, together with some brief expositions of the Scriptures, and a life of St. Anthony. His four *Orationes*, or *Discourses*, against the Arians, and his *Discourse* against the pagans, which are his largest works, were translated into English by Sam. Parker, and printed at Oxford, 1713, 2 vols. 8vo. His works, Gr. and Lat. two volumes, in three parts, were best published by Montfaucon, Paris, 1698; and Padua, 1777, fol. But a great number of letters, tracts, comments, and narratives, the production of subsequent ages, are falsely ascribed to him, and printed with his works. Among these, beyond all question, is the creed, *Quicumque vult*, falsely called the *Athanasian Creed*. See Cave, *Hist. Littérar.* i. p. 189. Oudin, *de Scriptor. Eccles.* tom. i. p. 312. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. v. p. 297. Montfaucon, *Pref. ad Opp. Athanasii*; and Schroëckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xii. p. 93—252. *Tr.*]

⁸ [In Cappadocia. *Tr.*]

⁹ His works are published by the Benedictine monk, Julian Garnier, Paris, [1721—1730.] 3 vols. fol. [Basil was born at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, about a. d. 329, and died archbishop of that church, a. d. 379, æt. 50. His first instruction in religion was from his grandmother Marina, a hearer and admirer of Gregory Thaumaturgus. His father, whose name was Basil, instructed

him in the liberal arts. Thence he went to Constantinople or to Cæsarea in Palestine, and studied under Libanius, the philosopher and rhetorician. Next he studied at Athens, under Himerius and Proteresiis, having Gregory Naz. and Julian the apostate for fellow students, in language, eloquence, poetry, history, and philosophy. In the year 355, he returned to Cappadocia, taught rhetoric a short time, and then retired for 13 years to a monastery in Pontus. From this time he became a most rigid ascetic, and a very zealous monk. He founded several monasteries, and composed rules and regulations for monks. In 363 he was called to Cæsarea, and ordained a presbyter; the next year, falling out with his bishop Eusebius, he retired to his monastery, but was soon recalled by the bishop. He was now a very popular and efficient preacher. On the death of archbishop Eusebius, in the year 370, Basil was raised to the archiepiscopal chair. He still dressed and lived like a monk, but was a most active and efficient bishop. He reformed the morals of the clergy, established rigid discipline in the churches, promoted orthodoxy and harmony in that jarring age, established alms-houses for the sick and indigent, and died triumphantly, on the 1st of January, 379. Eulogies of him were composed by Gregory Naz., Gregory Nyssen, (who was his brother,) Ephraem Syrus, and Amphilochius. He was a fine *belles lettres* scholar, an elegant writer, and a good reasoner. His works that remain are numerous, consisting of near a hundred discourses, sermons, and homilies, three hundred and sixty-five epistles, various ascetic tracts, controversial pieces, a liturgy, &c. One of his best pieces is, his treatise on the person and offices of the Holy Spirit. He is unequal in his performances, and comes much short of Chrysostom as an orator. Yet his enthusiasm, his flexibility of style, and his clear and cogent reasoning; notwithstanding the gloomy austerity of his monastic character, entitle him to that high rank among the ancient clergy, which has ever been assigned him. See Godf. Hermant, *Vie de S. Basile le Grand, Archevêque de Cæsarie en Cappadoce, et celle de S. Grégoire de Nazianze, Archev. de Constantinople*, Paris, 1679, 2 vols. 4to. Fabricius,

of Jerusalem, has left us some catechetical discourses, which he delivered at Jerusalem; but many suspect him of intimacy with the semi-Arians¹. *John*, for his eloquence surnamed *Chrysostom*, a man of genius, who presided over the church of Antioch and that of Constantinople, and has left us various specimens of his erudition, among which his public discourses, that were received with vast applause, stand conspicuous².

Biblioth. Gr. vol. viii. p. 60, &c. Jul. Garnier, *Vita Sti Basilii*, prefixed to the third vol. of his *Opp. Basilii*, Paris, 1730: and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xiii. p. 1—214. Milner's *Church History*, cent. iv. ch. 23. For his character as a pulpit orator, see Bernh. Eschenberg, *Gesch. der Religionsvortrag*, p. 150—162, Jena, 1785, 8vo; and J. W. Schmidt, *Anleitung zum populären Kanzelvortrag*, pt. iii. p. 87—90. ed. 2. Jena, 1800, 8vo. *Tr.*]

¹ The later editions of his works are, in England, by Tho. Milles, [Oxford, 1703, fol.], and in France, by the Benedictine August. Toutte, [Paris, 1720, fol.].—Cyril is supposed to have been born at Jerusalem, about the year 315. He was made deacon in the church of Jerusalem about A.D. 335, and presbyter perhaps three years after. On the death of Maximus the bishop, Cyril was raised to the episcopal chair. But the Arian controversy, and his contest with Acacius of Cæsarea respecting the priority of their episcopal sees, caused him to be twice deposed, (A.D. 357 or 358, and 360,) and to be expelled from his see by the emperor Valens in 367. But he returned after short intervals to his charge; and from 378, sat peaceably in his chair till his death, A.D. 386. He appears to have been truly orthodox, though not disposed to go to extremes. (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 26, and l. v. c. 9.) Of his works, we have twenty-three Lectures to Catechumens; the first eighteen on the creed of his church, (which was very nearly the same with what we call the Apostles' Creed,) and the other five, to the newly baptized, on the ordinances, baptism, chrism (or confirmation), and the Lord's supper. These lectures, though written when Cyril was a young man, and only a presbyter, about the year 348, or 349, are an invaluable treasure to us; as they are the most complete system of theology, and most circumstantial account of the rites of the church, which have reached us from so early an age.

They are plain, didactic treatises, well adapted to the object for which they were written. See Tzschirner, *de Chrys. Vet. Eccl. Oratoribus*, *Commentatio* vii. Lips. 1821, 4to. Besides these lectures, a letter of his to the emperor Constantius, giving account of a marvellous appearance of a luminous cross in the heavens, A.D. 351; and a discourse he delivered at Tyre, are preserved. See Cave, *Hist. Literar.*; Toutte, preface to Cyril's Works; and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xii. p. 343—444. *Tr.*]

² For the best edition of the entire works of this most elegant and gifted man, in eleven [thirteen] large folio volumes, we are indebted to the industry of Bernh. de Montfaucon, Paris, 1718—38. [John Chrysostom was the son of a respectable military gentleman of Antioch in Syria, named Secundus. He was born in the year 354, and lost his father in his childhood. Early discovering marks of uncommon genius, his mother Anthusa, a pious and excellent woman, procured for him the best instructors in all branches of learning. After spending three years in the family, and under the religious instruction of Melesius the bishop of Antioch, he attended the schools of Libanius, in rhetoric, of Andragathias, in philosophy, and of Carterius and Diadorus (afterwards bishop of Tyre,) in sacred literature, who taught him to construe the Scriptures literally. Distinguished as a scholar, he was also early pious; and about the age of twenty, embracing a monastic life, he retired to the mountains and spent four years in the society of an aged hermit, and two years more in a solitary cave. Nearly worn out by his austerities, he was obliged to return to Antioch, where he was made a deacon in 381, and commenced author at the age of twenty-six. Five years after he was ordained a presbyter, and began to preach. During twelve years he wrote and delivered an immense number of

Epiphanius, bishop of Salamina in Cyprus, has described the various sects of Christians, as far down as his own times, in a large volume; which, however, contains many defects and misrepresentations, arising from the credulity and ignorance of the author³. *Gregory of Nazianzus*, and *Gregory of Nyssa*,

sermons, orations, and homilies. In the year 398, he was made patriarch of Constantinople, and in that station laboured and preached incessantly. But his life was too austere, and his preaching too pungent, and his discipline too strict, for that corrupt metropolis. The empress, the lax clergy, and many courtiers combined against him. In the year 403, he was summoned before an irregular council, to answer to forty-six frivolous or false charges; and refusing to appear, he was condemned, deposed, and banished for contumacy. But his people were so tumultuous, that his enemies were compelled to recall him. The next year, however, A.D. 404, he was forcibly removed to Cucusus in Armenia, to the unspeakable grief of all good men. Here he suffered extremely, his health failed, and being removed to Pitius in Colchis, he died on the road thither, the 14th of September, 407, aged fifty-two years and eight months. For overpowering popular eloquence, Chrysostom had no equal among the fathers. His discourses show an inexhaustible richness of thought and illustration, of vivid conception, and striking imagery. His style is elevated, yet natural and clear. He transfuses his own glowing thoughts and emotions into all his hearers, seemingly without effort, and without the power of resistance. Yet he is sometimes too florid, he uses some false ornaments, he accumulates metaphors and illustrations, and carries both his views and his figures too far. The spirit of the man, and some idea of his style, may be learned from the following literal translation of a paragraph in one of his private letters to a friend, written during his exile:—"When driven from the city, I cared nothing for it. But I said to myself, if the empress wishes to banish me, let her banish me:—The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof. If she would saw me in sunder, let her saw me in sunder:—I have Isaiah for a pattern. If she should plunge me in the sea:—I remember Jonah. If she would thrust me into the fiery furnace:

—I see the three children enduring that. If she would cast me to wild beasts:—I call to mind Daniel in the den of lions. If she would stone me, let her stone me:—I have before me Stephen the proto-martyr. If she would take my head from me, let her take it:—I have John the Baptist. If she would deprive me of my worldly goods, let her do it:—naked came I from my mother's womb, and naked shall I return. An apostle has told me, 'God respecteth not man's person:' and, 'if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.' And David clothes me with armour, saying, 'I will speak of thy testimonies before kings, and will not be ashamed.'" The works of Chrysostom (including some falsely ascribed to him,) consist of about 350 sermons and orations, on a great variety of subjects and occasions; about 620 homilies, or exegetical discourses, on different books of the Old and New Testaments; and about 250 Letters; together with several tracts on monasticism, and a treatise on the Priesthood, in six books. There is also a *Liturgy* which bears his name, being that used at Constantinople, and which perhaps received some alterations from his hand. For an account of his life and writings, see Cave, *Hist. Littéraria*; Tillemont, *Mémoires à l'Hist. Eccles.* tom. xi. p. 1—405. 547—626. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. x. p. 245—490. Montfaucon, *Opp. Chrysost.* tom. xiii. p. 1—177. For the sentiments, character, and influence of the man, see A. Neander's *Johannes Chrysostomus und die Kirche in dessen Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1821-22. 2 vols. 8vo. Tr.]

³ His works, with a Latin translation and notes, were published by the Jesuit, Dionys. Petavius [Paris, 1622, 2 vols. fol. and Cologne (Lips.), 1662]. His life is given in a good sized volume, by Ja. Gervasius, Paris, 1738, 4to. [*Epiphanius*, of Jewish extract, was born at Bezauduea, a village near Eleutheropolis, about twenty miles from Jerusalem, about the year 310. He became a monk in early life, visited Egypt, fell into the toils of the Gnostics, escaped, was inti-

obtained much renown among the theologians and disputants of this age; nor, as their works show, were they altogether unworthy of commendation*. But posterity would have given

mate with St. Antony; and returning to Palestine in his 20th year, about 300, became a disciple of Hilarion, established a monastery near his native village, called Ancient Ad, where he lived more than thirty years. He read much, and was ordained a presbyter over his monastery. In the year 367 he was made archbishop of Constantia (formerly Salamis) in Cyprus, but still lived by monastic rules.—He engaged in all the controversies of the times, was an active and popular bishop for 36 years, and regarded as a great saint and worker of miracles. In 376 he was at Antioch, on the Apollinarian heresy; and 382, at Rome, on the Meletian controversy. He had a long and fierce contest with John, bishop of Jerusalem, respecting Origenism, which he regarded with strong abhorrence. His friend Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, having expelled some monks from Egypt, on the charge of Origenism, in the year 401, Epiphanius held a provincial of Cyprus, against that error; and as the expelled monks fled to Constantinople, Epiphanius followed them in 402, intending to coerce Chrysostom into a condemnation of those monks and of Origenism. But his enterprise wholly failed, and he died on his way home, A.D. 403, aged above 90 years. He became an author when turned of 60. His first work, *Auchoratus*, (*The Anchor*), was written A.D. 374, to teach the world genuine Christianity, in opposition to the prevailing and especially the Arian heresies. Soon after he composed his great work *contra octoginta Hereses*, in three books, divided into seven parts or *tomii*. He also made an Epitome of this work; and wrote a treatise on (Scripture) Weights and Measures; a Letter to John, bishop of Jerusalem; another to Jerome, and some other works of little value. It is said, he understood five languages, Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, Greek, and Latin. His learning was great, his judgment rash, and his credulity and mistakes very abundant.—See Cave, *Histor. Literar.* p. 231—234; and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. x. p. 1—100. *Tr.*]

* Tolerable editions of the writings of both these men were published in France during the seventeenth cen-

tury; but better editions are anticipated from the Benedictines. [After long delay, the first vol. of the expected Benedictine edition of Gregory Nazianzen's works appeared at Paris, 1778, by Clemenecet, large fol. Of the old editions, the best is that of Billius, Gr. and Lat. Paris, 1609, 1630, and Cologne, (Lips.) 1690, 2 vols. fol. His works, as here published, consist of about 50 Orations, or Sermons; near 250 Epistles; and about 140 Poems. Besides these, Muratori has published 228 Epigrams and short poems of his, in his *Anecdota Gr.* p. 1—116, Petav. 1709, 4to. Some of the orations are violent attacks upon Arians and others; many others are eulogies on his friends and on monks; and a few are discourses on practical subjects. Of the poems, one of the longest is an account of his own life. Most of them were written after he retired from public life, and are of a religious character, but of no great merit as specimens of genius. As an orator, Gregory Naz. is considered superior to Basil for strength and grandeur. He also possessed a fertile imagination. But he has little method, and he abounds in false ornament.—He was born about the year 325. His father, who was also named Gregory, was bishop of Nazianzus in Cappadocia, for about 45 years, from A.D. 329 to 374. His mother Nonna, like the mother of Samuel, devoted her son to the Lord before he was born. His education was begun at Cesarea in Cappadocia, continued at Cesarea in Palestine, and at Alexandria, and completed at Athens, at the age of 30, A.D. 355. He was at Athens about five years, and there commenced that intimacy with Basil the Great which lasted through life. On his return to Nazianzus in 356, he was baptized, and betook himself to a retired and studious life, for which he always manifested a strong predilection. In 361, his father compelled him to receive ordination as a presbyter; and the next year he preached his first sermon. On the death of Julian, who had been his fellow student at Athens, he composed two invectives against him. His friend, archbishop Basil, in the year 372, offered

them higher praise if they had been less fond of Origen, and more free from the false eloquence of the sophists. Among the Syrians, *Ephrem* has gained immortality for his name by the sanctity of his life, and by a great number of writings, in which he confutes heretics, explains the Scriptures, and treats on religious duties⁵. Among those of whom but few

him the bishopric of Sasima, which he refused with indignation, on account of his aversion to public life. Yet he afterwards consented to be ordained as assistant to his aged father, on condition of not being obliged to succeed him. Soon after the death of his father, in 374, he retired to Seleucia, and spent three years in obscurity. In 379, being pressed beyond the power of resistance, he went to Constantinople to preach to the remnant of the orthodox there. His success in converting Arians was here very great: and he was so popular, that the general council of Constantinople, and the emperor Theodosius, constrained him to accept the patriarchal chair of that metropolis. But before the council rose, it being objected to him, that it was irregular for a bishop to be transferred from one see to another, he gladly resigned. Returning to Nazianzus, he discharged the episcopal functions there for a short time. But in 383, he retired altogether from public life, and after about seven years, spent chiefly in writing religious poetry, he closed life, about A.D. 389. See Cave, *Histor. Litteraria*; and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xiii. p. 268—458. — Gregory, bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia, and younger brother of Basil the Great, was probably born about 331, at Cæsarea in Cappadocia. Of his early education little is known. He was no monk, and at first averse from the ministry. He was made bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia about the year 372. But soon after he was driven from his see, by the persecution of the Arians, and for several years travelled from place to place. In 378 he returned to his see. Afterwards he was much employed on councils, and was greatly esteemed by the orthodox. The council of Antioch, 379, appointed him to visit the churches in Arabia, and restore order there. On his way he visited Jerusalem, and was disgusted with the profligate morals there. In the year 381 he wrote his great work against Eunomius the Arian, in thirteen books, which procured him

great reputation. At the general council of Antioch, in the same year, he is reported to have made the new draft of the Nicene Creed, which was afterwards universally adopted by the orthodox. He was also at the council of Constantinople in 394, and probably died not long after. He was a man of considerable acumen, a zealous polemic, and an extravagant orator. His works consist of polemic discourses and treatises, orations, eulogies, letters, and homilies; and were published, Gr. and Lat., by Fronto le Duc, Paris, 1615, 2 vols. fol. to which Gretser added a third vol. Paris, 1618. The three vols. were reprinted, but less correctly, Paris, 1638, fol. A better edition has long been desired. See Cave, *Histor. Litter.* and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xiv. p. 3—147. *Tr.*]

⁵ A full account is given of him by Jos. Simon Asseman, in his *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. i. p. 21, &c. The English published several of his works, in Greek, at Oxford [by Edw. Thwaites, 1709, fol.]. The same were published in a Latin translation by Gerh. Vossius, [Rome, 1589—97, three vols. fol.] His works were published in Syria, a few years since, at Rome, by Steph. Euod. Asseman. [Six vols. in all; vol. i. ii. iii. Gr. and Lat. 1732—43—46; vol. iv. v. vi. Syriac and Lat. 1737—40—43, fol.—Ephrem Syrus, a monk and deacon of the church at Nisibis in northern Syria, was born and spent his whole life in and near that city. When elected bishop there, he feigned himself deranged, and absconded, to avoid promotion. He was a most ardent devotee of monkery, a man of genius, and prolific writer. His works consist of essays and sermons, chiefly on the monastic and moral virtues, commentaries on nearly the whole Bible, and hymns and prayers. A few of his essays are polemic. All his works were written in Syriac; and were so popular in Syria, as to be read in public after the Scriptures; and being early translated into Greek, were held in high estimation in

works have reached us, are *Pamphilus*, the martyr and intimate friend of Eusebius⁶; *Diodorus* of Tarsus⁷; *Hosius*, of Corduba⁸; *Eustathius* of Antioch⁹; *Didymus* of Alexandria¹;

that age. It is said that his hymns and prayers are still used in the Syrian churches. He died A.D. 378. See Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 115; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iii. c. 16; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* ii. c. 30, and iv. 29; Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. viii. 255, &c. and xv. 527, &c.; Milner's *Church History*, cent. iv. ch. 21. *Tr.*

⁶ [Pamphilus, a presbyter of Cæsarea in Palestine, was born at Berytus, studied under Pierius of Alexandria, and spent his life at Cæsarea. He was a learned, benevolent, and devout man, and a great promoter of theological learning. He procured an immense theological library, which he gave to the church of Cæsarea. Most of the works of Origen he transcribed with his own hand, and particularly the corrected copy of the Septuagint in Origen's *Hexapla*. One of these transcripts, P. D. Huët states, is still in the possession of the Jesuits of Clermont. He wrote a vindication and biography of Origen, in five books, to which Eusebius added a sixth book. The whole are lost, except a Latin translation of book first, made by Rufinus. During the persecution he was imprisoned two years, and then put to death. Eusebius, his great admirer, wrote his life, in three books, which are lost. See Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 77; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vi. c. 32; Cave, *Historia Litterar.* *Tr.*]

⁷ [Diodorus, or Theodorus, bishop of Tarsus, was head of a monastic school, and presbyter at Antioch, where he had Chrysostom for a pupil. He became bishop of Tarsus in 378, sat in the general council at Constantinople 381, and was succeeded at Tyre by Phalerius A.D. 394. He was a learned man, and a voluminous, though not an elegant writer. His works were chiefly scientific and controversial, in opposition to errorists and unbelievers; and explanatory of the Scriptures, which he construed literally. None of his works remain entire; but abstracts and numerous extracts are preserved by Photius and others. See Suidas, *ὡς ἀπὸ Διόδωρου*. Sozrates, *H. E.* vi. 3. Sozomen, *H. E.* viii. 2. Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 25. Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 119. Cave, *Histor. Litterar.* Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.*

vol. viii. p. 358, &c. Tillemont, *Mémoires à l'Hist. Eccles.* tome viii. p. 558, &c. 802, &c. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. x. p. 247—251. *Tr.*]

⁸ [Hosius, bishop of Corduba in Spain, was born about the middle of the preceding century, became a bishop before the end of it, and sat in the council of Miliberis, A.D. 305. He was chief counsellor, in ecclesiastical affairs, to Constantine the Great, who summoned him to the council of Arles, in 314, and sent him to Egypt, to settle the religious disputes of that country, in 324. He stood at the head of the council of Nice, in 325; and presided in that of Sardica, in 347. By the Arian council of Sirmium, 356, he was banished when near a hundred years old; and unable to resist, he now signed an artfully drawn Arian creed; and died A.D. 361, having lived more than a hundred years, and been a bishop during about 70. Nothing written by him remains, except an epistle to the emperor Constantius, preserved by Athanasius, in his *Historia Arianor. ad Monachos*. See Cave, *Histor. Litterar.* Tillemont, *Mémoires à l'Hist. Eccles.* tome vii. p. 300—321, and Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. viii. p. 399. *Tr.*]

⁹ [Eustathius, a native of Side in Pamphylia, was bishop of Beroa (now Aleppo) in Syria, and promoted to the patriarchate of Antioch by the council of Nice, A.D. 325. He had previously distinguished himself as an opposer of Arianism, and in that council he acted a conspicuous part. This, together with his *Libri viii. contra Arianos*, rendered him extremely obnoxious to the abettors of Arianism, who procured his condemnation in one of their councils, about the year 330. Eustathius appealed in vain to the emperor, Constantine the Great; he was banished to Trajanopolis in Thrace, where he died about the year 360. The only entire works of his now extant are, his treatise on the witch of Endor, in opposition to Origen; and a short address to the emperor, delivered at the council of Nice. These, together with a treatise on the *Heautimoron*, which is ascribed to him, were published by Leo Allatius, Lyons, 1629, 4to. What remains of his eight books against the Arians, was published by Fabricius,

Amphilochius of Iconium²; *Palladius*, author of the *Lausiac History*³; *Macarius*, senior and junior⁴; *Apollinaris*, senior⁵;

Biblioth. Gr. vol. viii. p. 170, &c. He was highly esteemed by the orthodox of his times. See Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 85. Chrysostom, *Laudatio Eustathii*, Opp. Chrysost. tom. ii. p. 603. Athanasius, *Epist. ad Solitarios*; Cave, *Histor. Litterar. Du Pin, Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclés.* vol. iii. Fabricius, *ubi supra*, p. 166, &c. and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. v. p. 275, &c. Tr.]

¹ [Didymus, a learned monk of Alexandria, and head of the catechetical school there, was the preceptor of Jerome and Rufinus. He lost his eye-sight when young, yet became very conspicuous as a scholar and a theologian. He was born about the year 311, and was alive A.D. 392, then more than 83 years old. Of his numerous works, only three have reached us; namely, *de Spiritu Sancto Liber*, preserved in a Latin translation of Jerome, (inter Opp. Hieronymi, tom. iv. pt. i. p. 393, &c.) *Scholia* on the canonical Epistles, also in a Latin translation. Both these are given in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. v. p. 320. 338. *Liber adversus Monachos*; Gr. and Lat. in Combefis, *Auctarium noviss. Biblioth. Patr.* pt. ii. p. 21, &c. Besides these, he wrote commentaries on the greater part of the Bible; and, *de Trinitate libri iii.*; *contra Arianos libri ii.*; and a comment on the four books of Origen, *de Principiis*; in defence of Origen's sentiments. See Jerome, *de Scriptor. Illustr.* c. 109; and Cave, *Historia Litteraria.* Tr.]

² [Amphilochius, after being a civil magistrate, and living a while with Basil and Gregory Naz. in their monastery, was made bishop of Iconium, in Lycæonia, about the year 370 or 375. He sat in the second general council at Constantinople, A.D. 381; and in the same year was appointed, by the emperor Theodosius, inspector of the clergy in the diocese of Asia. Two years after, wishing to persuade the emperor to enact severer laws against the Arians, he appeared in his presence, without showing respect to his son, the young Arcadius. At this the emperor was indignant. The bishop replied: "Sire, are you offended because indignity is offered to your son? Then, be assured God must abhor those who treat his Son with disrespect." The argument was irresistible, and the emperor granted his request. He probably died A.D.

395. Ten short pieces, chiefly orations, and various fragments, were published as his works, though most of them are of dubious origin, by Combefis, Gr. and Lat. Paris, 1644, fol. including the works of Methodius Patarens. and Andreas Cretensis. A few other tracts are extant under his name; and a considerable number, mentioned by the ancients, cannot now be found. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. vii. p. 500—507; Oudin, *Commentar. de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* tom. ii. p. 216, &c. Cave, *Histor. Litterar.* and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xii. p. 67—70. Tr.]

³ [Palladius of Galatia, born A.D. 368; at the age of 20 went to Egypt, to get a practical knowledge of monkery. After residing among the monks of Egypt several years, his health failed, and he returned to Palestine, still leading a monastic life. In the year 400, going to Bithynia, Chrysostom ordained him bp. of Hellenopolis, which he afterwards exchanged for Aspona in Galatia. After the fall of Chrysostom in 404, Palladius was banished, and died in exile about A.D. 431. His great work was composed about the year 420, and contains the history of the principal monks of his own times, with many of whom he was personally acquainted. Being written at the request of Lausus, the emperor's lord of the bed-chamber, it was called *Historia Lausiacæ*. It is the honest statement of a credulous monk, who almost adored the heroes of his story. Several Latin editions have been published. In Greek it appeared, Lugd. Bat. 1616, 4to; and Gr. and Lat. in the *Auctar. Biblioth. Patr.* Paris, 1624, tom. ii. p. 893—1053, fol. and in *Biblioth. Patr.* Paris, 1624, tom. xiii.—The other works ascribed to him are, *Dialogi de Vita S. Joh. Chrysostomi*, inter *Palladium Ep. Hellenopolitanum et Theodorum ecclesiæ Romanæ diaconum*, (extat inter Opp. Chrysost.) and *de Gentibus Indiarum et Brachmanibus Liber*.—See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. ix. p. 2, &c. Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs*, &c. Cave, *Historia Litterar.* Tillemont, *Mémoires de l'Hist. Ecclés.* vol. xi. p. 500, &c. Tr.]

⁴ [Macarius senior, or the Great, called the Egyptian Macarius, a native of Thebais, was born A.D. 302, early addicted himself to a monastic life, at the age of thirty retired to the wilder-

and a few others⁶, are most frequently mentioned, on account of their learning, and events in which they were concerned.

ness of Scetis, and the mountain Nitria, where he lived a hermit for sixty years. He became a presbyter at the age of forty, and died at the age of ninety, A.D. 391. Much is related of his austerities, his virtues, his wisdom, and his miracles. To him are ascribed, and it is probable, correctly, seven *opuscule* and fifty homilies or discourses; all upon practical and experimental religion: edited, last, by J. G. Pritius, Gr. and Lat. Lips. 1714, 2 vols. in one, 12mo, pp. 265 and 566.—Macarius junior, called the Alexandrian Macarius, because he was born and spent the first part of his life at Alexandria, was contemporary with Macarius senior, with whom he is often confounded. He was born about A.D. 304, pursued traffic some years, became a monk, retired to the wilderness of Scetis, was baptized at 40, became a presbyter, headed a numerous band of monks in the mountains of Nitria, and died about A.D. 404, aged 100 years. He was no less distinguished for his virtues and his miracles, than the other Macarius. Both copied after St. Antonius, both were hermits, inhabited the same region of country, and lived at the same time. But the senior Macarius was unsocial, especially with strangers; whereas the younger was very affable, and often visited the city of Alexandria; whence he was called πολιτικός, the citizen. The younger wrote nothing, but a single letter to his disciples. The code of thirty monastic rules, ascribed to him, was probably the production of a later age. Both are mentioned by most of the contemporary writers, as Jerome, Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, and especially Palladius, (*Lausiac History*, c. 19, 20,) who was disciple of the younger Macarius. But this history is little more than an account of their rules of life, their conversations, their miraculous deeds, the admiration in which they were held, and the crowds of visitors and disciples which attended them. See Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* i. iv. c. 23. Palladius, *Hist. Lausiacæ*, c. 19, 20. Rufinus, *Vite Patrum*, c. 23. Cassianus, *de Cenobior. Institut.* i. v. c. 41; and Collat. v. c. 12; xv. c. 3, xxiv. c. 13. Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* i. iii. c. 14, i. vi. c. 29. Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* i. iv. c. 21. Tillemont, *Mémoires à l'Hist. Eccl.*

tom. viii. p. 243. 264. 357. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. vii. p. 491, &c. Cave, *Histor. Litterar. T. I.*

⁶ [Apollinaris, or Apollinarius, senior, was born at Alexandria, taught grammar at Berytus, and at Laodicea in Syria, where he became a presbyter. He associated with Epiphanius the sophist, a pagan, and attended his lectures; for which, both he and his son, the younger Apollinaris, were excommunicated. But repenting, they were restored. In the year 362, when the emperor Julian prohibited the Christians from reading the classic poets and orators, Apollinaris and his son undertook to compose some sacred classics, to supply the place of the pagan. The father took up the Old Testament, and transferred the Pentateuch into heroic verse, in imitation of Homer; and also, according to Sozomen, the rest of the Old Testament history he formed into Comedies, Tragedies, Lyrics, &c. in imitation of Menander, Euripides, and Pindar. The son laboured on the New Test., and transferred the Gospels and the canonical Epistles into Dialogues, in imitation of those of Plato. Nearly all, if not the whole, of these sacred classics are lost. Yet there is extant a poetic Greek version of the Psalms, bearing the name of Apollinaris. The Tragedy of Christ suffering, published among the works of Gregory Naz., is also by some ascribed to the elder Apollinaris. The younger Apollinaris wrote likewise, *adversus Porphyrianum*, libri 30; *de Veritate*, *adv. Julianum et Philosophos*; *contra Eunomii Apolloniam Liber*; *Commentarii breves in Isaiam*; *Hymni et Cantica sacra*; *de Incarnatione Libellus*; *de Fide Libellus*; and several Epistles, of which two perhaps are extant. Of all the rest of his works, only fragments remain. The younger Apollinaris believed that the divine nature in Christ did the office of a rational human soul; so that God the Word, a *sensitire* soul (ψυχὴ) and a body, constituted the person of the Saviour. For this he was accounted a heretic, and condemned by public councils. He died between A.D. 330 and 392. Both were learned and excellent men, and strenuous opposers of the Arian creed. Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 101. Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 46, and iii. 16.

§ 10. Among the Latin writers, the following are most worthy of notice. *Hilary*, bishop of *Poitiers*, is famous for his

Sozomen, *H. E.* v. 18, and vi. 25. Philostorg, *H. E.* viii. H—15. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. vii. p. 659, &c. viii. p. 332. Tillemont, *Mémoires d'Hist. Eccles.* vol. vii. Cave, *Hist. Litteraria. Tr.*

⁶ [Less distinguished than the foregoing were, in the Eastern or Greek church, the pseudo-Dorotheus, a fabled bishop of Tyre, who was a confessor in the Diocletian persecution, and a martyr under Julian, aged more than 100 years. To him is attributed the Epitome of the lives of the Prophets, Apostles, and the seventy Disciples of Christ; extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. iii. p. 421. See Cave, *Historia Litterar.*

Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 312—325, famous as beginning the controversy with Arius, who was his presbyter. Of more than seventy epistles, written by him on the Arian controversy, only two are extant; preserved, one by Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 4, and the other by Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 6.

Constantine the Great, emperor A.D. 306—337. He wrote many epistles and some orations, which his secretaries translated into Greek. Of these, twenty-four Epistles and two orations are preserved by Eusebius and others, and among the acts of councils. Many of his edicts are also preserved in the *Code Theodosianus*.

Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, and afterwards court bishop of Constantinople, and the staunch patron of Arius. He was condemned in the council of Nice, and banished; retracted and was restored; became the great supporter of Arianism; and died A.D. 342. A single epistle of his has been preserved by Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 6.

James, bishop of Nisibis in Syria; a confessor in the Diocletian persecution, an assessor in the Nicene council, and died in the reign of Constantius. He probably wrote wholly in Syriac; but his works were first published, Armenian and Latin, by N. Antonelli, Rome, 1756, fol. containing nineteen essays and discourses, chiefly on moral and practical subjects.

St. Antonius, a renowned Egyptian monk, who flourished about A.D. 330. His life, written by Athanasius, is still

extant; likewise, his monastic rules, his remarks on cases of conscience, and about twenty Discourses. These *opuscula* were published in a Latin translation from Arabic, Rome, 1646, 8vo.

Asterius of Cappadocia, a fickle and ambitious man, in the period next following the Nicene council, and a zealous Arian. He was never admitted to the clerical office, possessed some talent, and wrote comments on the Scriptures, and tracts in favour of Arianism; of which, only fragments remain.

Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia. He held a council at Ancyra in 315, and was conspicuous in the orthodox ranks at the council of Nice. Afterwards his zeal against Arianism carried him into Sabellianism. He was condemned and deposed in 335, acquitted in 347, but still regarded with suspicion. He died A.D. 370. Many wrote against him; and he wrote much, but nothing but what time has consumed.

Theodorus, bishop of Heraclea in Thrace, A.D. 331—344, a semi-Arian, and a zealous opposer of Athanasius. He died about the year 358. His commentaries on various parts of the Bible are highly commended by Jerome and others, for their style and erudition. All are lost, except his commentary on the Psalms, which is prefixed to the *Catena Veterum Patrum in Psalmos*, ed. Antwerp, 1643, 3 vols. fol.

Acacius, bishop of Caesarea* in Palestine, A.D. 340—366, successor to Eusebius, whose secretary he had been; a man of learning and eloquence, but unstable, and fluctuating between Arianism and orthodoxy. He wrote much, particularly in explanation of the Scriptures; but nothing that has been preserved.

Triphilus of Ledris in Cyprus, flourished A.D. 340. He was bred to the bar, and was considered one of the most elegant writers of his age. He wrote on the Canticles, and the life of Spiridon, his bishop; but nothing of his remains.

Eusebius, bishop of Emesa in Phoenicia, was born at Edessa, studied there, and at Alexandria in Egypt, and Antioch in Syria. As early as 312, he was distinguished for scholarship and for unassuming modesty. He refused

twelve Books *on the Trinity*, and for other writings. He possessed a considerable degree of perspicuity and ingenuity; but

the bishopric of Alexandria in 341; but soon after accepted that of Emesa, and died about A.D. 360. He leaned towards semi-Arianism; wrote much and elegantly on the Scriptures, and against the Jews. What has been published as his, has been much questioned.

George, bishop of Laodicea, a staunch Arian, and active in all their measures, from A.D. 335 to 360. He wrote against the Manichæans; the life of Eusebius Emessenus; and several epistles, one of which is preserved by Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iv. c. 13.

Pachomius, (died 350,) Theodorus, his successor, and Oresisius, were distinguished contemporary monks of Tabennesis in Thebais, Egypt. They flourished from A.D. 340—350. Monastic rules, some epistles, and several discourses, are extant under the names of one or more of them.

Serapion, a monk of Thebais, distinguished for his learning and eloquence, was the friend of Athanasius, who made him bishop of Thmuis. He died about A.D. 358. Of his once popular writings, only his *Liber contra Manichæos* is extant; Latin, in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. iv. p. 160.

Basil, bishop of Ancyra, from 336 to 360, was a semi-Arian, highly esteemed by Constantius, and very active against the orthodox. Contention between him and Acacius preceded his deposition and banishment to Illyricum in the year 360. He wrote much, and in particular against Marcellus, his predecessor; but none of his works are extant.

Leontius, the Arian bishop of Antioch, A.D. 348—358, a crafty and deceptive man, who was active in the contentions of his times. Of his writings, only a fragment of one discourse remains.

Marcus, an Egyptian bishop, and a friend of Athanasius, banished in 356, by George, bishop of Alexandria. He wrote an oration against the Arians, which is published, with Origen's tract on the Lord's prayer, by Wetstein, Amsterd. 1695, 4to.

Ætius of Syria, a goldsmith, physician, deacon at Antioch, bishop somewhere, and finally a heretic. He held Christ to be a mere creature. He died about the year 366. His book, *de Fide*,

in forty-seven chapters, is transcribed and refuted in Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 76.

Endoxius, bishop of Germanicia on the Euphrates, and (356) of Antioch, and (360) of Constantinople; died A.D. 370. He was successively an Arian, a semi-Arian, and an Aëtian; a learned, but a verbose and obscure writer. Large fragments of his discourse, *de Incarnatione Dei Verbi*, are extant.

Eunomius, the secretary and disciple of Aëtius, but more famous than his master. He was made bishop of Cyzicum A.D. 360, banished soon after, wandered much, and died about A.D. 394. He wrote on the epistle to the Romans, many letters, his own creed, and an Apology for it. Only the two last are extant. He held Christ to be a created being, and of a nature unlike to that of God.

Meletius, bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, and (360) of Antioch. He was banished A.D. 361, returned under Julian; was banished again under Valens, and restored by Gratian, and died while attending the general council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, at an advanced age. There is extant (in Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 73, c. 29—34,) an able discourse, which he delivered at Antioch in 361, when, holding up three fingers, and then closing two of them, he said: "We conceive there are three persons, but we address them as one."

Titus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, was driven from his see, under Julian, A.D. 362; returned under Valentinian; and died about the year 371. He wrote *contra Manichæos libri iii.* which are extant in a Latin translation, in *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. iv. A discourse, likewise, on the branches of palm, Gr. and Lat., and a commentary on Luke, in Latin, have been published under his name, but are questioned.

Paphnutius, a celebrated Egyptian monk, who flourished A.D. 370. He wrote the life of St. Onyphrius, and of several other monks, still extant.

Cæsarius, younger brother of Gregory Nazianzenus, was a learned physician of Constantinople, and was elevated to civil office. He is said to have written several works, and particularly a treatise against the pagans. There are extant, under his name, four Dialogues, Gr. and

he was often disposed to borrow from *Tertullian* and *Origen*, whom he greatly admired, rather than to tax his own genius¹.

Lat. on 195 questions in theology ; in *Fronto le Due's Auctarium Biblioth. Patr.* 1624, tom. i. But they are supposed not to be his, as they show the hand of a well-read theologian.

Evagrius, archdeacon of Constantinople, in 381, and after 385, an Egyptian monk. He was a pious and learned man, and a considerable writer. Several of his devotional and practical works are extant, in the different collections of the works of the fathers.

Nemesius, bishop of Emesa, after being a Christian philosopher. He flourished A.D. 380, and with Origen, held the pre-existence of human souls ; as appears from his book, *de Natura Hominis*, extant in the *Auctarium Biblioth. Patr.* 1624, tom. ii. also printed Gr. and Lat. Oxford, 1671, 8vo.

Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople A.D. 381—398, orthodox and pious. One of his discourses is extant, *inter Opp. Chrysostomi*, who was his successor.

Flavianus, a monk, and bishop of Antioch A.D. 381—403. He first divided the choir, and taught them to sing the Psalms of David responsively. He was strenuous against the Arians ; but fragments only of his discourses and letters remain.

Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria A.D. 385—412, was famous for his contention with the Nitric monks, and for his opposition to Origenism. Of his works only a few epistles, and considerable extracts from his other writings, are extant.

John, bishop of Jerusalem A.D. 386—416, famous for his contests with Epiphanius and with Jerome, respecting Origen's character. Numerous works, perhaps without foundation, are published as his. They consist of commentaries on Scripture, and homilies. The homilies are printed among the works of Chrysostom ; and the whole are published as his works, Brussels, 1643, 2 vols. fol.

Hieronimus of Dalmatia, a presbyter, and a monk, who flourished A.D. 396. He is author of Lives of the Egyptian Monks ; the original Greek, though preserved, has not been published, because the Lausiac History of Palladius is nearly a literal translation of it.

Sophronius, the friend of Jerome, and translator into Greek of some of

his works, particularly of his book, *de Viris Illustribus*. He flourished about A.D. 390 ; and was, as Jerome says, "apprime eruditus ;" yet he is little noticed by other contemporary writers. *Tr.*]

¹ Concerning Hilary, the Benedictine monks have given an accurate account in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. [tom. i. pt. ii.] p. 139—193, [à Paris, 1733, 4to.] The best edition of his works is that of the French Benedictines, [by Contant, Paris, 1693, fol. revised and improved by Scip. Maffei, Verona, 1730, 2 vols. fol. Hilary of Poitiers in France, was a native of Gaul, of respectable parentage, and well educated. He was a pagan till he had attained to manhood. His consecration to the episcopal office was about the year 350. For twenty years he stood pre-eminent among the Gallic bishops, and did much to arrest the progress of Arianism in the West. In the council of Bessieres, A.D. 356, he handled the Arian bishops, Saturninus, Ursacius, Valens, and others, so roughly, that they applied to the emperor Constantius, and had him banished to Phrygia. During the four years he was an exile in Asia, he wrote most of his works, and was so active in opposing Arianism there, that the heretical clergy, to get rid of him, procured his release from banishment. He returned to his church a more able and more successful antagonist to the Gallic Arians than he was before. He was the principal means of rolling back the Arian current, which was sweeping over the West. His great work is his *de Trinitate libri xii.* He also wrote three different tracts addressed to the emperor ; an account of the synods in the East against the Arians ; concerning the councils of Arimini and Seleucia, and the events that followed to the year 366 ; Commentaries on Matthew, and on the Psalms. Besides these, he wrote several works which are lost, such as commentaries, hymns, epistles, &c. See Jerome, *de Viris Illust.* c. 100. Fortunatus, *de Vita Hilarii*, libri ii. (prefixed to the *Opp. Hilarii*, ed. Bened.) Contant, Life of Hilary, prefixed to the Benedictine edition of his works ; Tillemont, *Mémoires à la Hist. Eccles.* tom. vii. p. 442, &c. 745,

Lactantius, the most eloquent of the Latin Christians in this century, assailed the superstition of the pagans, in his *Divine Institutions*; and likewise wrote on other subjects. But he is more successful in confuting the errors of others, than in correcting his own⁸. *Ambrose*, first governor, and then bishop of *Milan*, is not rude in diction or conception, nor is he destitute of valuable thoughts; yet he is chargeable with the faults of the age, a deficiency in solidity, accuracy, and good arrangement⁹. *Jerome*, a monk of Palestine, has undoubtedly merited

&c.; and Schroeckh, *Kirchenesch.* vol. xii. p. 253—342. Hilary was learned, but his style is exceedingly swollen and obscure. *Tr.*]

⁸ Of Lactantius also, the Benedictines have given an account, in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 65, &c. His works have been through numerous editions; the latest and best are by the celebrated Baucmann [Lips. 1739, 8vo], the venerable Heumann, [Gotting. 1736, 8vo,] and Lenglet du Fresnoy, [Paris, 1748, 2 vols. 4to, and Zweybr. 1786, 2 vols. 8vo. Lucius Cæcilius Lactantius Firmilianus was probably a native of Italy; studied under Arnobius in Africa; removed to Nicomedia in the reign of Diocletian, and opened a school for rhetoric, in which he had but few pupils. He was made private tutor or governor to Crispus, the oldest son of Constantine the Great, when an old man; and probably died a little before A. D. 330. He was learned, though not a profound theologian, and the most elegant of all the Latin fathers. Some think him the best writer of Latin after the days of Cicero. His works still extant are,—*Dicinarum Institutionum* libri vii. written about the year 320. This is his great work. It may be called a Guide to true Religion, being designed to enlighten the pagans, and convert them to Christianity. *Institutionum Epitome*; or, an Abridgment of the preceding. It is imperfect, extending over the three last books only. *De Ira Dei*, and *de Opificio Dei*, or on the works of creation, particularly on the physical structure and powers of man. These two works are, properly, a continuation of the first, being written in furtherance of the same designs. *De Mortibus Persecutorum*; an account of persecutors and persecutions, from Nero to Maxentius, A. D. 312. There is no good reason to doubt its genuineness.

An English translation of this valuable treatise, with a long preface, was published by Gilb. Burnet, 1637, 18mo. *Symposium*; a juvenile performance, extant as the work of a fabled Symposium. The *Carmen de Phœnice*, is perhaps his. His lost works are,—*Grammaticus*; ὁδοπορικόν, a poetic account of his voyage to Nicomedia; *ad Asclepiadem* libri ii.; *ad Probum Epistolarum* libri iv.; *ad Severum Epistolar.* libri ii.; *ad Demetrianum Epistolar.* libri ii. See *Jerome de Viris Illust.* c. 80. Cave, *Historia Literar.* Lardner, *Credibility*, &c. vol. vii. Schroeckh, *Kirchenesch.* vol. v. p. 220—262. *Tr.*]

⁹ The Benedictine monks of France published his works in two large folio volumes [1686—1690. Ambrose was the son of a prætorian prefect of the same name, who was governor-general of Gaul, Britain, and Spain. After a good education for civil life, he became an advocate, counsellor to Probus, his father's successor, and at last governor of Liguria, and Aemelia, resident at Milan. In the year 374, Auxentius, bishop of Milan, died; and the Arians and orthodox became tumultuous in the church, when met to elect a successor. Ambrose entered the church to quell the riot, and a little child happening to say, "Ambrose bishop," the mob presently cried out, "Let him be the bishop." He was constrained to submit; gave up all his property, and his worldly honours, was baptized, and became a laborious and self-denying bishop. An irruption of barbarians in 377 obliged him to flee; and he went to Illyricum, and thence to Rome. In the year 381, he presided in the council of Aquileia. In 383, the emperor Valentinian sent him as ambassador to Maximus the usurper in Gaul. Next came his contest with Symmachus, prefect of Rome, respecting the rebuilding the pagan altar of Victory in that

esteem from the Christian world by many of his productions; but at the same time, his bitterness towards those who differed from him, his eagerness after fame, his choleric and ungovernable temper, his unjust aspersions on good and innocent persons, and other defects of character, have disgraced him not a little, in the view of those who are neither uncandid nor incompetent judges. Among his various writings, those which interpret the Holy Scriptures, and his *epistles*, are the most valuable¹. *Augustine*, bishop of *Hippo* in Africa, is

city. In 386, he had much contention with the Arians of Milan. Afterwards he was sent on a second embassy to Maximus. Three years after, he debarred the emperor Theodosius the Great from Christian ordinances, and required him to do penance, for the slaughter of the citizens of Thessalonica by his order. In 392, civil war obliged him to leave Milan for a time. He soon returned, but died A.D. 397, aged sixty-four years. He was devout, energetic, orthodox, and a very useful bishop. His knowledge of theology was not great; but he was able to read the Greek fathers, and he knew the world. His writings were numerous. On the Scriptures he wrote much, but nothing that is valuable. He wrote several treatises and discourses on monkery; *de officiis libri iii.*; *de Mysteriis liber*; *de Sacramentis libri v.*, which are greatly corrupted, if not altogether supposititious; *de Penitentia libri ii.*; also *de Fide*, or *de Trinitate libri v.*; and *de Spiritu Sancto libri iii.*; the two last were, in great measure, compilations from Greek fathers, and were addressed to the emperor Gratian. Several discourses and eulogies, and about ninety epistles, of his production, are extant; besides a great number of short sermons, scholia on the canonical epistles, and tracts of different kinds, which are falsely ascribed to him. His life, written by Paulinus, his private secretary, is stuffed with accounts of miracles and wonders performed by him. See *Opp. Ambrosii*, tom. ii. Appendix, ed. Benedict. Cave, *Historia Litterar.* Tillemont, *Mémoires à la Hist. Ecclés.* tom. x. p. 78—306. 729, &c. G. Hermant, *Vie de S. Ambroise*, à Paris, 1678, 4to. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xiv. p. 148—332, and Jos. Milner, *Church History*, cent. iv. ch. 12—16. 18. *Tr.*

¹ The defects of Jerome are learned-

ly exposed by Jo. le Clere, in his *Quæstiones Hieronymianæ*, Amstelod. 1700, 12mo. His works have been published by the Benedictines, [ed. Martianay, Paris, 1693—1706,] in five volumes folio. This edition was republished, with considerable additions [and improvements in the arrangement, the prefaces, and the explanatory notes,] by Vallarsius, Verona, [1734—43, eleven volumes, folio. —] Hieronymus Stridonensis, or Jerome of Stridon in Dalmatia, was born of Christian parents, about the year 331. His father, Eusebius, gave him the best advantages for education. He was early sent to Rome, where he studied many years, and under the best masters. About the year 363 he was baptized, and left Rome to travel for improvement in knowledge. He journeyed through Gaul, and resided a few years at Treves, where he became a monk, and devoured many books. On his return he spent some time at Aquileia, where he formed a close friendship with Rudinus. In 373 he left Aquileia, and embarked for Syria, in company with several friends, and carrying his own large collection of books. Landing in Thrace, he passed the Bosphorus, and travelled over land to Antioch. Here his friend Innocentius died, and he himself was dangerously sick. After recovering, he was induced by a dream to renounce for ever the reading of the pagan classics. From Apollinaris the younger he obtained farther instruction in biblical interpretation. In 374 he retired into the wilderness eastward of Antioch; and, supported by his friends, he there spent about four years in the character of a learned hermit and author, who, nevertheless, held correspondence with the world, and took part in the passing religious controversies. In 378 or 379, he returned to Antioch, and was ordained a presbyter.

one whose fame is spread throughout the Christian world. And he certainly possessed many and great excellencies, a superior genius, an unfailing love of truth, admirable patience of labour, unquestionable piety, with a delicacy and an acuteness by no means contemptible. But his power of judging was not equally great; and often a sort of constitutional warmth had more power over this excellent man than reason and prudence. He has, therefore, afforded many, abundant means for controversy on his real sentiments, and others, for taxing him with inconsistency, and a headlong speed in

The next year he visited Constantinople, to enjoy the instructions of Gregory Nazianzen. Here he continued two or three years, formed a better acquaintance with the Greek fathers, and translated some of their works; in particular, Eusebius' *Chronicon*, which he continued down to A. D. 378; and Origen's *Homilies on Jeremiah*. In 382 he accompanied Paulinus and Epiphanius to Rome, respecting the contests in the church of Antioch. Damasus, bishop of Rome, was much pleased with him, employed him occasionally as a private secretary, and prompted him to write on several biblical subjects, and, at length, to undertake a correction of the vulgar Latin Bible. Jerome likewise did much to promote monkery in Italy. But the ardour that he kindled upon this subject among the Roman ladies, created him enemies among the other sex. He also gave offence to the clergy of Rome, and thought it best to leave Italy in 385, and return to the East, with Paula, and Eustochium her daughter, wealthy Roman ladies, whom he had rendered enthusiastic in regard to monastic institutions. He first went to Antioch, and thence to Jerusalem, where he and his ladies performed a winter's pilgrimage. In the spring of 386 they went to Alexandria, and thence to visit the Nitric monks. Returning the same year to Palestine, they took up their permanent residence at Bethlehem. Here Paula erected four monasteries, three for nuns, and one for monks. In this last, Jerome passed the remainder of his days in reading, composing books, and contending with all who presumed to differ from him on any subject in which he took interest. He is said to have died on the 30th of September, A. D. 420, aged ninety years. Jerome was the best informed of all the Latin fathers, in *sacred literature*. The

Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, were all familiar to him; and he had a very extensive acquaintance with the best writers of both the Latin and the Greek churches. He likewise possessed genius, industry, and literary enterprise, in no ordinary degree. He was also acute and discriminating; but his vivid imagination, and his choleric temper, which scorned all restraint, rendered him one of the most caustic and abusive controversial writers that ever pretended to be a Christian. When he has no antagonist, and sees no enemy, he is a charming writer, yet enthusiastic, and often hasty and injudicious. The greater part of his works, and particularly his translations and commentaries on the Bible, were written while he resided at Bethlehem. As given to us in the Benedictine edition, in five volumes, vol. 1st contains his translations of the whole Bible; namely, the canonical books of the O. T. from the Hebrew; also Job, Psalms, Tobit, and Esther, translated from the Greek; and the whole N. T. with copious notes, from the Greek. Vol. IInd contains some glossaries, and numerous tracts and letters on a variety of subjects in sacred literature. Vol. IIIrd contains his commentaries on all the Prophets. Vol. IVth contains his commentary on Matthew, and on the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Titus, and Philemon; and about 120 Letters and Essays, narrative, polemic, apologetic, &c. The Vth vol. contains only works falsely ascribed to Jerome. See Cave, *Historia Litterar.* Tillemont, *Mémoires à l'Hist. Ecclés.* tom. xii. p. 1-356. Martianay, *Vie de St. Jérôme*, Paris, 1706, 4to. J. Stilling, *Acta Sanctior.* Septembris, tom. viii. p. 418-688. Antw. 1762, fol. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xi. p. 3-239. J. Milner, *Church Hist.* cent. iv. ch. 10. Tr.]

writing upon subjects insufficiently considered². *Optatus of Mileri*, an African, has obtained considerable reputation, by

² [After the edition by the theologians of Louvain, [Antwerp, 1577, 10 vols. fol.] the Benedictine monks gave a neat and accurate edition of Augustine's work [Paris, 1679—1700, 11 vols. fol.]. This was reprinted, with enlargements, in Holland, or as the title says, at Antwerp, under the eye of Jo. Le Clerc, with the assumed name of Jo. Phereponus, [1700—1703, 12 vols. fol. printed at Amsterdam. It was also reprinted at Venice, 1729—1735.] The Jesuits censure many things in the Benedictine edition. [They think the editors leaned too much towards the Jansenists, between whom and the Jesuits there was a long and violent controversy respecting the sentiments of Augustine. — Aurelius Augustinus was born Nov. 13, A. D. 354, at Tagaste, an obscure village in Numidia. His father, Patricius, was a pagan, till near the close of life. His mother, Monica, was eminently pious. He had a good school education in grammar and rhetoric, but he would not study Greek. At fifteen he came home, and lived idle and vicious. At seventeen he was sent to Carthage, where he shone as the first scholar in the rhetorical school. But he was dissipated, and became a Manichean. He kept a mistress, who bore him a son when he was but eighteen. This son, named Adeodatus, was well educated, became pious, was baptized at the same time with his father, at the age of fifteen, and died soon after. While a student at Carthage, Augustine lost his father. By reading Cicero's *Hortensius*, he became enamoured with philosophy, and began to seek it in the Bible; but not finding there that sublime system of which Cicero had given him an ideal, he threw aside the sacred volume. At the age of twenty, he had read and mastered nearly all the liberal sciences, as they were then taught. He now returned to Tagaste, and there opened a school for rhetoric. About the year 380, he again settled at Carthage, where he taught rhetoric about three years. During this period, his attachment to Manichæism diminished. He was restless, debauched, and unprincipled; yet was a fine scholar, and quite popular. In 383 he went to Rome, and the next year to Milan, in the character of a teacher of rhetoric. The eloquence of Ambrose drew him

to attend public worship; and under the discourses of that able and faithful preacher, Augustine's mind was gradually enlightened, and his conscience awakened. He had sharp and painful convictions, and became altogether a new man. He was baptized A. D. 387, set out for Africa the same year, buried his mother, stopped at Rome, and did not reach Africa till A. D. 388. He sold his estate, and devoted the avails to charitable purposes; and for three years lived as a recluse, with a few devout young men; and spent much time on scientific and metaphysical subjects. In the year 391, he went to Hippo regius, (now Bona in Algiers,) where he was made a presbyter, and preached and laboured with great success. Four years after, Valerius, his aged bishop, who was a native Greek, and who felt the need of such an assistant as the now renowned presbyter of Hippo, caused him to be ordained his colleague bishop. From A. D. 395 to A. D. 430, Augustine, as bishop of Hippo, was indefatigable in preaching, writing, combating error and vice, and infusing life and spirituality into the churches and clergy, far and near. He died on the 28th of August, A. D. 430, aged 76 years. See Cave, *Hist. Litterar.* Tillmont, *Mémoires à l'Hist. Eccl.* vol. xiii. ed. Paris, (it is omitted in the Brussels ed.) J. Stilling, *Acta Sanctor.* Augusti, tom. vi. p. 213—460; Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xv. p. 219—530; Jos. Milner's *Church Hist.* cent. v. ch. 2—9; and especially, *Augustini Confessionum libri xiii.* written about A. D. 400; Opp. tom. i. ed. Benedict.—The works of Augustine are so numerous, that even their titles cannot be here enumerated. Volume I. of the Benedictine edition, contains his *Retractions*, or corrections of his own works, in two books, written A. D. 426; his *Confessions*, in 13 books; and 13 works composed before he was a presbyter, on scientific, moral, and polemic subjects. Vol. II. contains 270 Epistles. Vol. III. contains 16 Treatises on Biblical questions and subjects. Vol. IV. contains his *Exposition of the Psalms*. Vol. V. contains 394 of his popular sermons; and 317 falsely ascribed to him. Vol. VI. contains 31 Tracts on moral, monastic, and practical subjects. Vol. VII. is occupied by his 22 books *de Civitate Dei*,

his work, not inelegantly written, *on the Schism of the Donatists*³. *Paulinus* of Nola has left us some epistles and poems, which are neither very bad nor very good⁴. *Rufinus*, a presbyter of *Aquilaia*, acquired fame by translating into Latin various works of the Greek fathers, in particular of *Origen*; by his bitter contests with *Jerome*; and by some expositions of the Holy Scriptures. His would have been no ignoble place among the Latin writers of this century, had he not met with an adversary so powerful and abusive as *Jerome*⁵. For an account

or history of the visible kingdom of God, from the creation to his own times;—a most learned work. Vols. VIII., IX., and X., contain his polemic works; against the Manichees, the Arians, the Antitrinitarians, the Origenists, the Jews; the Donatists; and against the Pelagians. The eleventh vol. contains his life, indices, &c. *Tr.*—Cave says that *Augustine* was not made bishop until 396, and then against his will; he considering his appointment uncanonical. He was set apart for it by *Megalius* of Calama, primate of Numidia. *Ed.*]

³ After the edition of Gab. Albaspinus, [Paris, 1631, and 1679, fol.] Lud. Ell. du Pin, doctor of the Sorbonne, published the works of *Optatus*, with judicious illustrations, [Paris, 1700, fol.—Of *Optatus*, all that is known is stated by *Jerome*, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 110; namely, “that he was an African, and bishop of Milevi, who was on the side of the Catholics; and that he wrote, during the reign of *Valentinian* and *Valens*, (A. D. 364—375,) six books against the slander of the Donatists; in which he maintains that the wrong doing of the Donatists is erroneously charged on us.” His work is entitled, *Contra Parmenianum secte Donatistice apud Carthaginam episcopum, de Schismate Donatistarum Libri vii.* It is a polemic work, in answer to a book published by *Parmenianus*; and contains much of the history of that schism, as well as of the arguments by which each party maintained its own principles, and defended its own conduct. *Tr.*]

⁴ The best edition of *Paulinus* is that published by Jo. Bapt. le Brun, Paris, 1685, 4to, [in two volumes: which L. A. Muratori republished, with some additions, Verona, 1736, fol.—*Mercopius Pontius Anicius Paulinus*, a Roman of patrician rank, was born at Bourdeaux in France, A. D. 353. He first studied under the poet *Decius Ausonius*; then went to Rome, became a popular advo-

cate, and was made consul about the year 375. About 379, he commenced his travels or wanderings in Italy, Gaul, and Spain, accompanied with his pious wife *Theresia*. During this period he formed acquaintance with *St. Ambrose*, *St. Martin*, and many other eminent saints. He was baptized at Bourdeaux, A. D. 391; and gradually parting with most of his large estate, which he bestowed in charity, he retired to Barcelona in Spain, where he lived some years as a recluse or monk. In 393 he was ordained a presbyter at Barcelona. The next year he removed to Nola in Campania, where he had a small estate near to the grave and the church of *St. Felix*, at which numerous miracles were supposed to take place, and which, of course, was a great resort of the admirers of sacred relics and wonders. Here *Paulinus*, in the year 402, erected an additional church, which he adorned with emblems of the Trinity, and other religious devices. In 409 he became bishop of Nola, and reigned in that office till his death in 431. He was esteemed one of the greatest saints; and was undoubtedly very religious, though his piety was of a superstitious cast. His writings consist of about 50 letters to his friends, written with a pleasing simplicity of style, and exhibiting a true picture of his devout mind, yet containing little that is of much importance; also 32 poetic effusions, of a similar character with his letters; 15 of which are in praise of *St. Felix*. He was highly esteemed by his contemporaries, and by the pious in after-ages. For an account of him and his works, see *Gennadius*, *de Viris Illustribus*. c. 48, with the Notes of *Fabricius* in his *Biblioth. Patristica*; *Le Brun*, *Vita Paulini*, in his *Opp. Paulini*; *Cave*, *Historia Literar.* Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. vii. p. 123—132; *Jos. Milner*, *Church Hist.* century v. ch. 13. *Tr.*]

⁵ *Richard Simon*, *Critique de la Bib-*

of Philastrius⁶, Damasus⁷, Juvenius⁸, and other writers of less note, the reader is referred to those who professedly treat of all

Bibliothèques des Auteurs Ecclésiast. par M. Du Pin, tom. i. p. 124, &c. A particular and full account is given of him, and his reputation is defended, by Justus Fontanus, *Historia Litteraria Aquileiensis*, lib. v. p. 149. [See also P. Th. Cacciari, *Dissertatio Historica de Vita, Fide, &c. Rufini*, subjoined to his edition of *Rufinus' Hist. Eccl.* and de Ruheis, *Dissert. de Tyrannio Rufino Presbytero*, &c. Venice, 1754, 4to.—Gennadius, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 17. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. x. p. 112—133. Cave, *Histor. Litter.*—Rufinus Toranus, or Tyraninus, was probably born at Concordia, near Aquileia, about A.D. 330. After living several years in a monastery at Aquileia, and forming acquaintance with Jerome, he was baptized there in 371. Soon after, the fame of the oriental monks led him to visit them. Landing at Alexandria, he became acquainted with a rich Roman lady, named Melania, who was as great an admirer of monkery as himself. She became his patron, supported him, and travelled with him, through the remainder of his life. During his six years' residence in Egypt, he spent some time among the monks in the Nitric wilderness, and also heard lectures from the famous Didymus of Alexandria. About the year 378, he and Melania removed to Jerusalem, where they spent many years. Melania occupied a nunnery, in which she supported a considerable number of devout sisters. Rufinus resided with other monks in cells about the mount of Olives; was much respected; often visited by pilgrims; and lived in the greatest intimacy with Jerome, who then resided at Bethlehem. About the year 390, he was ordained a presbyter, by John bishop of Jerusalem; and soon after, the quarrel between him and Jerome, respecting Origen's orthodoxy, commenced. In the year 397, that controversy seemed to subside; and shortly after, Rufinus and Melania removed to Rome. Here his publications concerning Origen rekindled the quarrel with Jerome; and both Origen and Rufinus were pronounced in the wrong by Anastasius the Roman pontiff. In the year 399, Rufinus removed to Aquileia, where he spent several years in translating works of Origen, and writing apologies for him and for himself. At length, after Alaric and his

Goths began to lay waste all Italy, Rufinus and Melania set out for Palestine, and got as far as Sicily, where Rufinus closed his life A.D. 410.—Rufinus was a man of respectable talents, of considerable learning, a handsome writer, and a very diligent scholar. His orthodoxy and his piety ought never to have been called in question. The abusive treatment that he received from Jerome, will account for the irritation of his feelings at times, without supposing him destitute of grace.—His work which is most frequently quoted in modern times, is his *Eccelesiastical History*. The first nine books are a free translation of the ten books of Eusebius, with considerable omissions in the latter part, and some additions in the first seven books. The two last books (the tenth and eleventh) are a continuation by Rufinus. This work has been very severely censured; but of late it is held to be of some value. The first good edition of it was by P. Th. Cacciari, Rome, 1740, 2 vols. 4to.—Besides this, Rufinus wrote *Vite Patrum*, or a history of the eastern monks; often published, and of about the same value as the other works of the kind: also an exposition of the Creed; the best that has reached us, from so early an age: two Apologies for Origen, and a translation of Pamphylus' Apology for him:—two defences of himself against Jerome, one of which is lost:—Commentaries on 75 of the Psalms, and on Hosea, Joel, and Amos,—if they are genuine.—He translated the works of Josephus; the *Recognitions* of Clement; various Commentaries of Origen, and his four books of *Principiis*; several works of Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, Anatolius, and Evagrius.—An imperfect collection of his works was published by de la Barre, Paris, 1580, fol. A much better edition, in 2 vols. fol. was commenced at Verona, by Domin. Vallarsi, of which the first vol. appeared in 1745. *Th.*]

⁶ [Philastrius, or Philaster, bishop of Brescia in the north of Italy, A.D. 379—387. While a presbyter, he is said to have travelled nearly all over the Roman empire, combating and endeavouring to convert errorists of every sort, and especially Arians. At Milan he was severely handled by Auxentius the Arian bishop. Ambrose, the successor

the Christian writers. I will, however, just mention *Sulpitius Severus*, a Gaul, who wrote history better than any other in this age⁹; and *Prudentius*, a Spanish poet of considerable merit¹.

of Auxentius, showed him kindness, and ordained him bishop of Brescia. His praises are told by Gaudentius, his immediate successor in the see of Brescia. His only work is, *de Hæresibus Liber*, in 150 chapters. It enumerates more heresies than any of the other ancient works; but no one considers it an accurate and able work. Philastrius was doubtless a pious and well-meaning man; but he was incompetent to the task that he undertook. See Cave, *Historia Litterar.* Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. ix. p. 362—384. The work is extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. iv. p. 701, and ed. Helmstadt, 1611, 4to, and by J. A. Fabricius, Hamb. 1721, 8vo, and among the collected Works of the early bishops of Brescia, Brixia, 1733, fol. *Tr.*]

⁷ [Damasus, bishop of Rome, A.D. 366—384, is said to have been of Spanish extract, but his father was a presbyter of Rome; and he was probably born there about the year 305. On the death of Felix, A.D. 366, there was great competition for the episcopal chair; and two bishops were chosen and ordained, namely, Damasus and Ursinus, or Ursicinus. Much confusion and even bloodshed followed. But the party of Damasus finally triumphed. Damasus was active in putting down Arianism in the West; and being requested, he aided the eastern churches in healing their divisions. For these purposes he held several councils, and wrote several letters, some of which are extant. Two synodical epistles and a confession of faith are preserved by Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 22, and l. v. c. 10, 11. An epistle to Paulinus, bishop of Antioch, and about forty epitaphs, inscriptions, epigrams, &c. are also extant. His book, *de Virginitate*, is lost. Several spurious epistles, as well as the *Liber Pontificalis*, or Brief History of the Popes, are falsely ascribed to him. The best edition of his works is that by A. M. Merenda, Rome, 1754, fol. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 103. Cave, *Histor. Litterar.* Bower, *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i. p. 179—233, ed. 2nd. Lond. 1749. Merenda, in his ed. of the works of Damasus, and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. viii. p. 107—122. *Tr.*]

⁸ [Caius Vettius Aquilinus Juvenius. Nearly all that is known of the man is told by Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 84. He says: "Juvenius, of noble extract, a Spaniard, and a presbyter, composed four books, in which the four Gospels are put into hexameter verse, almost verbatim; also some poems in the same measure, relating to the order of the sacraments. He flourished under the emperor Constantine." The four books of Evangelical History are of the nature of an imperfect harmony of the Gospels, on the basis of Matthew. Juvenius possessed considerable poetic genius, and understood versification very well. His lines are flowing and easy; but he was more solicitous to give the history truly, and as nearly as possible in the language of the Bible, than to decorate the narrative by flights of fancy and poetic imagery. The best edition is that of Erh. Reusch, Francof. and Leips. 1710, 8vo. The other poems mentioned by Jerome are lost. But in the *Novæ Collectio vet. Monumentorum*, tom. ix. p. 15, &c. by Edw. Martene, Paris, 1724—33, there is a poetic version of the book of Genesis, which bears the name of Juvenius. See Cave, *Historia Litterar.* and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. v. p. 262—265. *Tr.*]

⁹ [Sulpitius Severus was born in Aquitain Gaul, of noble extract, and brought up under Phœbadius, bishop of Agen in Guienne. In his youth he studied eloquence, and afterwards became an advocate, and married a lady of consular rank. Subsequently he became a monk under St. Martin, and a presbyter at Prinnulum, a village between Narbonne and Toulouse. He was intimate with St. Martin of Tours, Paulinus of Nola, and Jerome. In his old age, Genadius tells us, he was entangled by the metaphysics of the Pelagians; but recovering himself, he ever after kept silence. He is supposed to have died about A.D. 420, far advanced in life. His style is chaste and neat, much beyond the age in which he lived; whence he has been called the *Christian Sallust*. His best work is a Church History, *Historia Sacra*, in two books, from the creation to A.D. 400. It is a condensed narra-

tive, in a very classic style, and composed with some ability and fidelity. Besides this, he wrote the Life of St. Martin; three epistles concerning him; and three dialogues on the miracles of the oriental monks, and on those of St. Martin. Several epistles of his are lost. To him Paulinus of Nola addressed fourteen epistles, which are still extant. His works have been often printed. The last edition, perhaps, is that of G. Hornius, Lugd. Bat. 1647, 4to; often reprinted, 8vo. See Gennadius, *de Viris Illust.* c. 19. Cave, *Historia Litteraria. Tr.*]

¹ [Aurelius Prudentius Clemens, of Spain, was born A.D. 348; but whether at Tarragona, Calahorra, or Saragossa, is not settled. In his youth he studied eloquence, and afterwards managed causes and filled civil offices, as an unprincipled man. He was openly vicious, and he served some time in the army. At length, when turned of 50, he became thoughtful, his whole character was changed, and he devoted himself to writing moral and religious poetry. In the year 405, he wrote *καθημενῶν* (*liber*), or twelve Latin hymns, adapted to our daily devotions. His other poems are, *ψυχομαχία*, or the conflict between virtuous and vicious passions; *περί σφεδάνων*, or fourteen elegies on various martyrs; *ἀποθιώσεις*, or on the divine nature, in opposition to pagans and heretics; *ἀπαρτίγνῆς*, or the origin of sin; two books against Symmachus, and the worship of idols; and (if it be genuine,) *διττοχάϊον*, or a *dessert*, taken from the Old and New Testament; some write it *διπτερον*, the *Diptych*, or *list of saints* in the Old and New Testaments. His commentary on the hexæmeron is lost. Prudentius was something of a poet; but has been greatly overrated by many. His diction is not pure, nor his versification correct, and his thoughts are often flat prose, and drag along to excessive length. A good critic has observed, that he was a better Christian than poet. Yet he has many agreeable passages, and some that are really fine. He also serves to illustrate the history and the religious views of the age in which he lived. His collected works were published by Weitzel, Hanov. 1613, 8vo; with notes by Heinsius, Amstelod. 1667, 12mo; and in usum Delphini, Paris, 1687, 4to.—See Gennadius, *de Viris Illust.* c. 13. Cave, *Hist. Litterar.* Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. vii. p. 100—123.

The Latin writers of inferior note, omitted by Dr. Mosheim, are the following.

Anastasia, a noble Roman lady, the wife of Publius, and a martyr in the Diocletian persecution, A.D. 303. Two letters addressed from her prison to Chrysogonus, a confessor, are extant under her name. See Suidas, in voce *χρυσόγονος*.

Theonas, a bishop, but where, is not known. An excellent letter of his, addressed to Lucian, the emperor's chamberlain, is extant in Dacherii, *Addit. ad Spicileg.* tom. xi. or the new ed. tom. iii. p. 297. It is supposed to have been written about A.D. 305; but whether the present Latin is the original, or only a translation, is uncertain. See Cave, *Hist. Litterar.* vol. i. p. 172, 173.

Rheticus, bishop of Autun in France. He was in high esteem during the reign of Constantine; and wrote a commentary on the Canticles, and a great volume against the Novatians; both of which are lost. Jerome, *de Viris Illust.* c. 82.

Donatus, an African bishop, from whom the *Donatist* faction took its name. According to Jerome, (*de Viris Illust.* c. 93,) he wrote many tracts in support of his sect, and likewise a book on the Holy Spirit, which accorded with Arian views. None of his works are extant. He was expelled from Carthage, A.D. 356.

Julius, bishop of Rome, A.D. 337—352, a strenuous opposer of the Arians, and a patron of Athanasius. Two of his epistles are extant; one, addressed to the oriental bishops, and the other, to the Alexandrians, in favour of Athanasius. Both are preserved in the works of Athanasius, and the latter also by Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 22. See Cave, *Hist. Litterar.*, and Bower, *Lives of the Popes*.

Julius Firmicus Maternus, probably was first a pagan, and then a Christian. He wrote a book on the falsehood of the pagan religions, addressed to the emperors Constantius and Constans, which has been often printed. There are extant, likewise, eight books on astronomy or mathematics, which bear his name.

Fortunatianus, born in Africa, and for many years bishop of Aquileia in Italy. After contending long and strenuously against the Arians, he joined with them in 354, and became as active

against the orthodox. He wrote commentaries on the Gospels: but nothing of his remains.

Vitellius, an African Donatist, who flourished about A. D. 344. He wrote on the world's hatred to the servants of God; against the pagans; against the Catholics as traitors, and some other tracts. See Gemadius, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 4. Nothing of his remains.

Macrobius of Africa. As a catholic presbyter, he wrote a book addressed to confessors and virgins; afterwards, as a Donatist bishop resident at Rome, he composed the martyrdom of Maximianus and Isaac, two Donatists. A large fragment of the last is extant in Mabillon, *Antieq.* tom. iv. He flourished A. D. 344.

Liberius, bishop of Rome, A. D. 352—366. He had a warm discussion with the emperor Constantius, in the year 355, at Milan, respecting the persecution of the orthodox by the Arians, for his opposition to which he was banished. During his exile he relapsed, signed an Arian creed, and was restored, A. D. 358. His dialogue with the emperor at Milan is extant in Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 16, and sixteen of his epistles are collected in the *Acta Concil.* tom. ii. col. 743.

Eusebius Vercellensis, was a native of Sardinia, and first a lecturer at Rome, then bishop of Vercelli in the north of Italy, and flourished A. D. 354. For his vigorous opposition to the Arian cause, he was banished in 355, first to Scythopolis in Syria, thence to Cappadocia, and afterwards to Thebais in Egypt. Under Julian he regained his liberty, travelled extensively in the eastern provinces, was at several councils, and returning to Italy, died A. D. 371. He translated the commentary on the Psalms by Eusebius Cesariensis into Latin; but it is lost; and wrote four letters which are still extant. A manuscript of the four Evangelists, according to the old Italic version, written with his own hand, is preserved in the archives of the church of Vercelli, and was published by J. A. Irici, Milan, 1748.

Lucifer Calaritanus, a bishop in Sardinia, contemporary with Eusebius Vercellensis, and his companion in exile. He was founder of the sect called Luciferians, who held no communion with Arians, or even with such as had been Arians. Lucifer was a man of violent passions, and bold even to rashness. He addressed two indecorously written books

to the emperor Constantius; and wrote likewise, *On apostate Princes; On having no intercourse with heretics; On showing no indulgence to offenders against God; That life is to be sacrificed for the Son of God; and a short Epistle to Florentius.* These were published, Paris, 1568, 8vo. and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. iv. p. 181; but the best edition is by Joli, Dominic, and Ja. Coleti, Venice, 1778, fol.

Hilarinus, a native of Sardinia, deacon at Rome, and associated with Eusebius Vercell. and Lucifer Calarit. in an embassy to Constantius, and by him sent with them into exile. He became a Luciferian. To him are attributed—though without sufficient proof—the Questions on the Old and New Testaments, printed among the works of Augustine, vol. iv., and the Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul, published among the works of Ambrose.

Phœbadius, bishop of Agen, in the south of France, from, at least, 359—392. He was famous, in connexion with the three preceding, in the Arian contests in the West. His Book against the Arians is still extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. iv. p. 300, ed. Paris, 1589; and by Casp. Barth, Francf. 1623, 8vo.

Zeno, bishop of Verona, who flourished about A. D. 390. To him are ascribed ninety sermons on various texts and subjects, which were compiled from Basil, Hilary, and others. They are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. iii. p. 359.

Fabius Marius Victorinus, of African birth, was a distinguished pagan rhetorician at Rome, who became a convert to Christianity about the middle of this century, and died about A. D. 370. While a pagan, he wrote or translated several treatises on philosophy, grammar, and rhetoric; most of which are lost. After his conversion, he wrote on the holy Trinity; against the Arians, four books; to Justin the Manichean; against the Manichean principle of two first causes; on the commencement of the day, whether it be at evening, or in the morning; on the generation of the divine Word; against Candidus the Arian; three hymns; on embracing the *homousian* faith; a poem on the seven Maccabees; and commentaries on some of Paul's epistles, which were never published. His style is intricate, obscure, and inelegant. Most of what he wrote after his conversion is extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, tom. iv. p. 293. See Jerome, *de Viris Illustr.* c. 101, and the Notes of J. A. Fabricius.

Candidus, an Arian, who flourished about A.D. 364. He composed a book on the divine generation, addressed to F. M. Victorinus, which, with the answer of Victorinus, was published by Andr. Rivinus, Gothæ, 1656.

Pacianus, bishop of Barcelona in Spain, who flourished about the year 370, and died before A.D. 390. He wrote a book called *Cereus*, which is lost; also three epistles against the Novatians; an exhortation to penitence; and a tract on baptism, addressed to catechumens; all of which were published, Paris, 1538, 4to; Rome, 1564, fol. *Biblioth. Patrum*, tom. iv., and still better, in Aguirre, *Collectio Max. Concil. Hispan.* tom. ii. p. 79, &c.

Anicia Falconia Proba, a noble lady of Rome, distinguished for her rank, her piety, and her beneficence. She flourished about A.D. 370. After the death of her husband, she lost most of her property by the incursion of the Goths, and fell into the hands of Alaric, who carried her to Africa, where she died in the first part of the fifth century. Her *Cento Virgilianus de rebus Divinis* is extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, tom. v. p. 1218, and Cologne, 1601, 8vo, and Halle, 1719, 8vo.

Faustinus, a presbyter among the Luciferians at Rome, flourished A.D. 364. He wrote a petition to the emperors Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius; to which is prefixed a Confession of faith; and subjoined is the Rescript of Theodosius. He also wrote a book on the Trinity, against the Arians. His works are in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, tom. v. p. 673, and were printed, Oxford, 1678, 8vo.

Siricius, bishop of Rome, A.D. 385—398, is the earliest Roman pontiff whose Decretal Epistles are allowed to be genuine. Five of his Epistles are in the *Acta Concilior.* tom. ii.; but the 4th, which is addressed to the bishops of Africa, is demonstrably spurious. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. viii. p. 122—129; and Bower, *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i. p. 233—277.

Idacius Clarus was a Spanish bishop, perhaps of Merida, and flourished A.D. 385. He was conspicuous as an opposer of the Priscillianists; suffered banishment; and wrote an *Apologeticum*, which is lost; a book against Virimundus, an

Arian deacon; Explanation of some difficult passages of Scripture; and other tracts against heresies; all of which are extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, tom. v. p. 726.

Gaudentius, bishop of Breseia, in northern Italy, (a different person from Gaudentius, a contemporary Donatist bishop of Tamugada in Africa,) was travelling in the Asiatic provinces, when he was elected successor to Philastrius, bishop of Breseia, and was compelled to return and accept the office. He brought with him, from the East, relics of about forty saints; and served the church till A.D. 410, or, as some say, till 427. He wrote fifteen discourses or tracts on various subjects; also, On the unjust steward; On the text, "My Father is greater than I;" and the Life of Philastrius: all published, Petav. 1720, 4to.

Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, A.D. 390—426, was a man of much influence, and wrote, A.D. 419, a circular Epistle on the condemnation of Pelagius and Cœlestius; which, with the letter of the emperor Honorius to him, on the same subject, is in Baronius, *Annals*, A.D. 419, p. 455, and in the *Concil. Collect.* tom. ii. col. 1609.

Tichonius, or Tychonius, flourished A.D. 390. He was a learned, moderate Donatist; and wrote Seven Rules for interpreting Scripture (extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, tom. vi. p. 49). Three books on intestine war; Explanation of divers causes; and a Commentary on the Apocalypse. Some have supposed the eighteen Lectures on the Apocalypse, printed among the works of Augustine, to be this Commentary of Tichonius. See Gemadius, *de Viris Illust.* c. 18. Augustine, *de Doctrina Christiana*, l. iii. c. 30, and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xi. p. 374—382.

Petilianus, a leading Donatist bishop in Numidia, flourished A.D. 399. He wrote *de uno Baptismo*; and a circular Epistle to his party: to both which Augustine wrote formal answers. His works are lost.

Faustus, a Manichean bishop in Africa, flourished A.D. 400. He wrote a book against the orthodox faith; which Augustine quotes, entire, and refutes at large, in thirty-three books. *Tr.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. State of theological learning.—§ 2. Increase of superstition.—§ 3. Hence innumerable pious frauds.—§ 4. Interpreters of the sacred volume.—§ 5. Mode of explaining the Christian doctrines.—§ 6. Doctrinal writers.—§ 7. State of controversial theology.—§ 8. Disingenuous methods of disputing.—§ 9. The principal disputants.—§ 10. Practical theology.—§ 11. Faults of the moral writers.—§ 12. The number of mystics increased, and their doctrines established.—§ 13, 14. Monkish societies.—§ 15. Different orders of monks.—§ 16. Two pernicious moral doctrines.—§ 17. Lives and morals of Christians.—§ 18. Controversy with Meletians.—§ 19. The Eustathian troubles.—§ 20. The Luciferians.—§ 21. The Aërian controversy.—§ 22. Jovinianus.—§ 23. Controversies relating to Origen.—§ 24. Their extension.—§ 25. Controversy respecting his writings.

§ 1. THAT the elementary principles of the Christian religion were preserved entire and inviolate in most churches is certain; but it is equally certain, that they were very often unskillfully and confusedly explained and defended. This is manifest from the discussions concerning the three persons in the Godhead, among those who approved the decisions of the council of Nice. There is so little clearness and discrimination in these discussions, that they seem to rend the one God into *three* Gods. Moreover, those idle fictions, which a regard for the Platonic philosophy and for the prevailing opinions of the day had induced most theologians to embrace, even before the times of *Constantine*, were now in various ways confirmed, extended, and embellished. Hence it is that we see on every side evident traces of excessive veneration for saints in heaven, of belief in a fire to purify souls on leaving the body, of partiality for priestly celibacy, the worship of images and relics, and for many other opinions which, in process of time, almost banished the true religion, or at least very much obscured and corrupted it.

§ 2. Genuine piety was gradually supplanted by a long train of superstitious observances, which were derived, partly from

opinions inconsiderately embraced, partly from a preposterous disposition to adopt profane rites, and combine them with Christian worship, and partly from the natural predilection of mankind generally for a vain sort of ostentation in religion. At first, frequent pilgrimages were undertaken to Palestine, and to the tombs of the martyrs; as if *thence* men could bear away the radical principles of holiness, and certain hopes of salvation¹. Next, from Palestine and from places venerated for sanctity, portions of dust or earth were brought, as most efficacious remedies against assaults of evil; and these were bought and sold every where at great prices². Further, the public supplications, by which the pagans were accustomed to appease their gods, were borrowed from them, and were celebrated in many places with great pomp. To the temples, to water consecrated with certain forms, and to likenesses of holy men, the same efficacy was ascribed, and the same privileges assigned, as had been attributed to the pagan temples, statues, and lustrations, before the advent of *Christ*. Pictures were, indeed, as yet but rare, and statues not in use. It is, however, particularly shameful, but beyond all doubt, that honours paid to the martyrs were gradually assimilated, with no bad intention, unquestionably, yet with great injury to the Christian cause, to the worship which the pagans had in former times paid to their gods³. From these specimens, intelligent readers will easily conceive how much injury the church received from the peace and repose procured by *Constantine*; and from an indiscreet eagerness to allure the populace within her pale.

¹ See Gregory Nyssen, *Oratio ad eos qui Hierosolymam adeunt*; Opp. tom. iii. p. 568. Hieronymus, *Ep. xiii. ad Paulinum, de Institut. Monachi*; Opp. tom. i. p. 66. Ja. Godfrey, *ad Codicem Theodos.* tom. vi. p. 65, &c. Peter Wesseling, *Diss. de causis peregrinat. Hierosolymit.* prefixed to the *Itinerarium Burdigalense*; among the *Vet. Romanor. Itineraria*, p. 537.—[Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, seems to have been the first who gave the signal for these religious journeys. At least, it is stated by Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* l. i. c. 17, and by Theodoret, *II. E. lib. i. c. 18*, that she was instructed by a dream to go to Jerusalem, and that she wished to find the grave of Christ; that she actually did find three crosses, with a super-

scription; that one of them instantly cured a dying woman, and was therefore concluded to be the cross of Christ. She gave a part of it to the city of Jerusalem; and sent the other part to the emperor, who incased it in his own statue, and regarded it as the *Palladium* of his new city; and that the people used to assemble around this statue with wax candles. See J. Andr. Schmidt, *Problem. de Crucis Dominice per Helenam Constantin. Imp. matrem inventionē*, Helmst. 1724. *Schl.*]

² Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, l. xxii. c. 8, § 6, and many others.

³ This is shown at length, by Is. de Beausobre, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, tom. ii. p. 642, &c.

But the plan of this work will not admit of long details respecting such discreditable courses.

§ 3. This ill-advised piety of the people opened a wide door for endless frauds to persons base and bold enough to seek dishonourable gain in the folly and ignorance of others. Rumours were artfully disseminated of prodigies and wonders seen in certain edifices and places (a trick before this time practised by the pagan priests), whereby the infatuated populace were drawn together, and the stupidity and ignorance of those who looked upon every thing new and unusual as a miracle, were often wretchedly imposed upon⁴. Graves of saints and martyrs were supposed to be where they were not⁵; the list of saints was enriched with fictitious names, and even robbers were converted into martyrs⁶. Some buried blood-stained bones in retired places, and then gave out that they had been informed in a dream, that the corpse of some friend of God was there interred⁷. Many, especially of the monks, travelled through the different provinces, and not only shamelessly carried on a traffic in fictitious relics, but also deceived the eyes of the multitude by inventing combats with evil spirits⁸. It would require a volume to detail the various impositions which were, for the most part, successfully practised by artful knaves, after genuine piety and religion were compelled to resign their dominion in great measure to superstition.

§ 4. Many laboured earnestly, few successfully, on the sacred volume. *Jerome*, a man of great industry, and not unskilful in the languages, made a new Latin translation of the sacred books; which was more lucid, and considerably better than any of the numerous old Latin versions⁹. He also took

⁴ Henry Dodwell's *Dissertat.* ii. in *Trenmann*, § 56, p. 196, &c. Jo. Le Clerc, in his *Appendix Augustiniana*, p. 492. 550. 575.

⁵ *Concilium Carthagin.* v. canon. 14, tom. i. *Conciliorum*, p. 983, ed. Harduin.

⁶ Sulpitius Severus, *de Vita S. Martini*, cap. 8.

⁷ Augustine, *Sermo* 313, § 1. *Opp.* tom. v. p. 886, ed. Antwerp.

⁸ See Ja. Godfrey, *ad Codicem Theodos.* tom. iii. p. 172. Augustine, *de Opere Monachorum*, cap. 28, § 36. *Opp.* tom. v.

p. 364. Jerome, *Epistola ad Rusticum*; *Opp.* tom. i. p. 45.

⁹ See Ja. Fran. Buddeus, *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 1332, &c.—[That there were many Latin versions extant in the fourth century, is very clearly stated by Augustine, *de Doctrina Christiana*, l. ii. c. 11. Of these, (as Augustine tells us, *loc. cit.*) one was called (*Italic*) the *Italic*. But it has become usual to apply this designation to every ancient Latin version, which was not amended by Jerome; and this has given occasion to many mistakes. See Mosheim, *de*

much pains to set forth a more correct edition of the Greek version by the Seventy: and the same thing, we are told, was undertaken by *Eusebius*, *Athanasius*, and *Euthalius*¹. The expositors of Scripture form a long list: among whom the most distinguished are *Jerome*, *Hilary*, *Eusebius*, *Diodorus* of Tarsus, *Rufinus*, *Ephraem Syrus*, *Theodorus* of Heraclea, *Chrysostom*, *Athanasius*, and *Didymus*. Yet few of these have correctly discharged the duty of interpreters. *Rufinus*, indeed, *Theodorus* of Heraclea, *Diodorus*, and a few others, followed the literal sense of Scripture²: the rest, after the example of *Origen* their guide, search for recondite meanings; and accommodate, or rather constrain, the half-understood language of the Bible to speak of sacred mysteries and a Christian life³. *Augustine* and *Tychonius* wished to establish rules for interpretation, but neither of them had ability to do it⁴.

§ 5. The doctors who were distinguished for their learning, explained the sacred doctrines after the manner of *Origen* (on whom they all fixed their eye), in accordance with the principles of that philosophy which they learned in their youth at school, namely, the Platonic philosophy as corrected by

Robus Christianor. ante Const. M. p. 225—229. Jerome mentions a version, which he calls (*Vulgate*) the *vulgar*, and which counsellor Michaelis takes to be that used at Rome in the days of Jerome. These translations, in respect to their diction, were neither classical nor tolerable; yet they may be of use to those who wish to become acquainted with the Latin language in its fullest extent. They contain an immense number of Hebraisms, or rather Syriasms; which leads to the conjecture, that their authors were in great measure Jews. These versions fell into great disorder, in which no two copies were alike; because different translations were in fact blended together, the words of one Evangelist were transferred into the narrative of another, and many glosses were incorporated into the text. This induced the Roman bishop Damasus to commit the improving of these ancient versions to Jerome, who undertook the business in the year 384. He erased the false and incorrect readings, and improved the translations, which came into his hands very faulty, uniformly guiding himself by the original text. The improved version of Jerome is, a few alterations

excepted, that *Vulgate* which is held in so high estimation by the Roman Catholic church. The really new translation of the Bible by Jerome, was published from manuscripts by the Benedictine monks Jo. Martiani and Ant. Pouget, Paris, 1693, under the title, *Sacri Eusebii Hieronymi divina Bibliotheca, hactenus inedita*. Their *Prolegomena* are worth reading. See Rich. Simon, *Histoire Critique des Versions du Nouveau Test.* cap. 7—12; and Michaelis, *Introduction to the New Test.* *Schl.*)

¹ Jo. Frick, *de Canone Novi Testamenti*, p. 180.

² Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiast.* par M. Du Pin, tom. i. p. 51. 90. 129, and tom. iv. p. 335, &c. and *Histoire Critique des Principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Test.* cap. vi. &c. p. 83, &c.

³ See Gregory Nazianzen, *Carmen de se ipso*; in Ja. Tollii *Inscript. Hæneris Italici*, p. 27. 57. He very much commends this method.

⁴ Augustine, in his six books *de Doctrina Christiana*; Tychonius, in his seven Rules of Interpretation; which are extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum maxima*, tom. vi. p. 48.

Origen. Those who wish to get a full insight into this subject, may examine *Gregory Nazianzen* among the Greeks, and *Augustine* among the Latins; who were regarded in the subsequent ages as the only patterns worthy of imitation, and may be fitly styled, next to *Origen*, the parents and supporters of philosophic or *scholastic* theology. They were both admirers of *Plato*, and held as certain all his decisions which were not absolutely repugnant to the truths of Christianity: and proceeding upon these as their first principles, they drew from them many and very subtle conclusions. There was, however, at the same time, another class, which daily increased in number, and which considered the knowledge of divine things as attainable, not by *reasoning*, but by *contemplation*, and by calling away the mind from converse with external objects to concentration in itself. These are commonly called *mystics*. That these abounded, appears from several considerations, and particularly from the numerous herds of monks who were spread nearly all over the Christian world; and from the works of *Dionysius*, that *coryphæus* of the mystics, which were produced, it seems, in this age, and by some one of this class.

§ 6. Among the writings of this age, in which the doctrines of Christianity are stated and explained, the first place is justly due to the catechetical discourses of *Cyril*, bishop of Jerusalem. For those who would persuade us that these discourses were the production of a subsequent age, are so blinded by zeal for a party as not to discern the truth⁵. Many would also here place the *Divine Institutions* of Lactantius; but improperly, because this work aims rather at confuting those who still adhered to polytheism, than unfolding the truths taught by inspiration. The *System of Doctrine* addressed to the clergy and laity, which is ascribed to *Athanasius*, appears to have been the production of a later age⁶. There are, however, in the works of *Athanasius*, *Chrysostom*, the *Gregories*, and others, as now extant, many passages from which we may learn how the best-informed men of this age handled the leading topics of the Christian religion. On the *Trinity*, in particular, we have the twelve books of *Hilary* of Poitiers. The

⁵ See Jo. Fecht, *Comment. de Origine Missarum in honorem Sanctorum*, p. 404, &c.

⁶ [It is not so much a treatise on dogmatics, as one on morals, containing rules of life, especially for monks. *Schl.*]

Ancoratus of *Epiphanius* explains the doctrine concerning *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit*. On *baptism*, we have the work of *Pacianus*, addressed to the catechumens; and a work of *Chrysostom*, on the same subject, in two books. The works of *Jerome*, *Augustine*, and others, which were designed to impart correct views on religious subjects, and to confute the opposers of the truth, are here omitted.

§ 7. From the disputes with those who were regarded as opposed to divine truth, the ancient simplicity had nearly taken its flight; and in place of it, dialectical subtilties and quibbles, invectives, and other disingenuous artifices had succeeded, more becoming the patrons than the opposers of error. Censures of this habit, by men of eminence, are still extant⁷. I pass in silence those rhetorical figures and flourishes by which many endeavoured to parry the weapons of their adversaries, and to involve in obscurity the question under discussion; likewise the inclination to excite odium against their antagonists, so common to many; and the disregard of proper arrangement and of perspicuity, and other habits which were no better in their discussions. Yet so far were some writers of this century from disguising these faults, that they rather claimed praise for them. It must be owned, however, that their antagonists made use of the same weapons.

§ 8. With the ancient form of discussion, new *sources of argument* were in this age combined. For the truth of doctrines was proved by the number of martyrs who had believed so, by prodigies, and by the confessions of devils, that is, of persons in whose bodies some demon was supposed to reside. The discerning cannot but see, that all proofs drawn from such sources are very fallacious, and very convenient for dishonest men who would practise imposition. And I greatly fear, that most of those who at this time resorted to such proofs, though they might be grave and eminent men, may be justly charged with a dangerous propensity to use deception. *Ambrose*, in controversy with the *Arians*, brings forward persons possessed with devils, who are constrained, when the relics of *Gervasius* and *Protasius* are produced, to cry out, that the doctrine of the Nicene council, concerning three persons in

⁷ Methodius, cited by Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 64. Opp. i. p. 563; Gregory Nazianzen, in many places; and others.

the Godhead, is true and divine, and the doctrine of the Arians false and pernicious. This testimony of the prince of darkness *Ambrose* regards as proof altogether unexceptionable. But the Arians openly ridiculed the prodigy, and maintained that *Ambrose* had bribed these infernals to bear testimony in his favour⁸. And many, I am aware, will be more inclined to believe the Arians than to give credit to *Ambrose*, notwithstanding that he is enrolled among saints, and they among heretics⁹.

§ 9. Besides *Apollinaris*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Cyril of Alexandria*, and others, who confuted the emperor *Julian*, the adherents to idolatry were vigorously and successfully encountered by *Lactantius*, by *Athanasius*, by *Julius Firmicus Maternus*, by the younger *Apollinaris*, whose books against *Porphyrus* are unhappily lost, by *Augustine* in his twenty-two books on the City of God, and in his three lost books against the pagans, and above all, by *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*, in his *Evangelical Preparation*, and in his book against *Hierocles*. Attempts to convert the Jews were made by *Eusebius* of *Emesa*, by *Diodorus* of *Tarsus*, and by *Chrysostom*, in his six books still extant. Against all the heresies, *Ephraim Syrus*¹, *James* of *Nisibis*, *Didymus*, and *Audentius*, took up the pen. So did *Epiphanius*, in his extensive work on the heresies, which he denominated *Panarium*; and *Gregory Nazianzen*, more concisely, in his *Oration on the Faith*. The short works of *Augustine* and *Philustrus* rather enumerate the heresies than confute them.

§ 10. The state of moral or practical theology would have been very flourishing if the progress of any branch of knowledge could be measured by the number of the writers on it; for very many laboured to perfect and inculcate practical religion. Among the orientals, the efforts of *James* of *Nisibis*, or as some say, of *Saruga*², and *Ephraem Syrus*, were very considerable in this department. What we meet with respecting

⁸ *Ambrose*, *Epist.* xxii. p. 878, &c. *Paulinus, de Vita Ambrosii*, p. 81.

⁹ See *Jo. Le Clerc, Appendicæ Augustiniana*, p. 375. More examples of this kind might be mentioned. See *Gregory Nyssen, de Vita Gregorii Cæsariensis*, Opp. tom. ii. p. 977, 978; *Sulpitius Severus, Historia Sacra*, l. ii. c. 33, p. 261.

¹ See *Jos. Sim. Asseman, Biblioth.*

Orient. Clement. Vaticana, tom. i. p. 118, 125, &c. From his extracts it appears that *Ephraem*, though a pious man, was not a dexterous polemic.

² *Jos. Sim. Asseman, in his Biblioth. Orient.* &c. tom. i. p. 17, thinks, that the writings ascribed to *James* of *Nisibis*, should rather be ascribed to a person of *Saruga*. But in his addenda, p. 558, he corrects his opinion in some measure.

the life and duties of a Christian, in the writings of *Basil the Great*, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Chrysostom*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, and others, can neither be altogether approved, nor wholly condemned. Many give the preference to the three books of *Ambrose*, on the duties of ministers of the church, which are written after the manner of *Cicero*: and they certainly deserve commendation, so far as the writer's intentions and beautiful sentiments are concerned; but they contain many things which may justly be censured. Perhaps, before all others who wrote on practical piety, the preference is due to *Macarius*, the Egyptian monk³; from whom, after deducting some superstitious notions, and what savours too much of Origenism, we may collect a shining picture of holiness.

§ 11. Nearly all the writers in this department are defective in the following respects. First, they pay no regard to method and just arrangement, in respect to the subject which they have undertaken to explain. They rarely define, never divide, but pour out whatever comes uppermost in their minds, which, though pious, are not very clear and correct. In the next place, they either neglect to trace the duties of men back to their sources, and their first principles, or they derive them from precepts and doctrines which are either manifestly false, or not fully ascertained. Lastly, when they come to the proof of their positions, most of them do not resort to the law of God for arguments to enforce duty and put down vice, but to airy fancies, to frigid allegories, and fine-spun subtilties, better suited to tickle the imagination than to awaken and overpower the conscience.

§ 12. But these works are far more tolerable than that combination of the precepts of *Christ* with those of *Plato*, or rather with those of the Alexandrian philosophers—the followers of *Ammonius Saccas*; and that twofold kind of piety, the one more perfect and complete, and the other less so, which almost all now embraced. How very much these views of religion had gained ground, may appear from the fact, that those who had long cried up a sort of recondite and mysterious knowledge of divine things, wholly different from the common knowledge of the vulgar, were bold enough in this century to attempt to perfect their views and to reduce them to a regular system. It

³ See the *Acta Sanctorum*, Januarii, tom. i. p. 1005.

is most probable, that among the Greeks of this century, (though some think him earlier, and some later,) that fanatic lived, who assumed the name and character of *Dionysius the Areopagite*, *St. Paul's* disciple; and who under the cover of this shield gave laws to such as wished to withdraw themselves by contemplation from the world, and bring back to its original, the soul that came from God⁴. As soon as the writings of this man passed into the hands of the Greeks and Syrians, and especially into those of the solitaries and monks, it is not easy to describe how much darkness spread over the minds of many, and what an increase of numbers there was among those who preached up, that converse with God is to be sought by mortifying the senses, withdrawing the thoughts from all external objects, subduing the body with hunger and hardships, and fixing the attention on God and eternal things, in a kind of holy indolence.

§ 13. The truth of these remarks is evinced by that vast multitude of monks and sacred virgins who spread themselves, as soon as peace was given to the Christians, with astonishing rapidity, over the whole Christian world. Many persons among Christians, of this description, had long lived by themselves in the deserts of Egypt. *Antony* was the first, who in the year 305 collected them into an associated community in

⁴ Those who have written concerning this deceiver, are enumerated by Jo. Fran. Buddeus, *Isagoge ad Theophrastum*, l. ii. ch. iv. § 8, p. 602, &c. See also Jo. Launoï, *Judicium de Scriptis Dionysii*; Opp. tom. ii. pt. i. p. 562. Matur. Veiss de la Croze, in his *Histoire du Christianisme d'Éthiopie*, p. 10, &c. endeavours to prove that Synesius, a celebrated philosopher and bishop in Egypt, of the fifth century, was the author of the Dionysian writings; and that he designed by them to support the doctrine of but one nature in Christ. But he uses feeble arguments. Nor are those more substantial, by which Jo. Phil. Baratier (in his *Diss.* subjoined to his book *De Successione Romanor. Episcop.* p. 286) endeavours to prove, that Dionysius of Alexandria was the true author of those writings. — [The real author of these works is wholly unknown. That he was not Dionysius the Areopagite, mentioned Acts xvii. 34, as he pretends to be, and was generally believed to be, from the sixth century on to the fifteenth, is cer-

tain. That he was a Greek who lived some time in the fourth century, is generally admitted; though some place him a century later. That he was Apollinaris senior, or junior, of Laodicea, several have laboured to evince, but without much success. He was orthodox, pious, and certainly not destitute of talent. His works consist of single books, on the Celestial Hierarchy, or the invisible world, or the church above; on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, or the visible church of God on the earth, its order, worship, and ordinances; on the Divine Names, or the designations of God in the Scriptures; on Mystical Theology, or on the perfections of God; and eleven Epistles. These, with the commentaries of some of the later Greek theologians, and notes by the moderns, were printed, Gr. and Lat. Antwerp, 1634, and Paris, 1644, 2 vols. fol. See Cave, *Historia Litterar.* Duillé, *de Scriptis Dionysii Areopagite*, Geneva, 1666, 4to. Bp. Pearson, *Vindicie Iynaticæ*, pt. i. c. 10. Tr.]

Egypt, and regulated their mode of living by fixed rules⁵. His disciple *Hilarion*, the next year, undertook the same thing in Palestine and Syria. About the same time, *Aones* or *Eugenius*, with his associates *Gaddanas* and *Azyzus*, introduced this mode of life into Mesopotamia and the neighbouring countries⁶. These were imitated by many others with so much success, that in a short time all the East swarmed with persons who, abandoning the occupations and conveniences of life, and all intercourse with society, pined away amidst various hardships, hunger, and sufferings, in order to maintain a more close communion with God and the angels. The Christian church would have remained free from these numerous tormentors of their own minds and bodies, had it not given admittance to that great and high-sounding doctrine of the ancient philosophy, which made happiness and heavenly converse depend upon such a separation of soul from body as required enervation of the frame.

§ 14. This austere discipline passed from the East into the West, and first into Italy and the adjacent islands, though it is uncertain who conveyed it thither⁷. Afterwards, *St. Martin*, the celebrated bishop of Tours, erected some monasteries in Gaul, and by his example and his discourses produced such eagerness to embrace a monastic life, that two thousand monks are said to have assembled together at his funeral⁸. From thence this way of life gradually extended over the other countries of Europe. Those, however, who would acquaint themselves with these matters, should know that there has always been a wide difference between the monks of the West and those of the East; and that the former could never be

⁵ Antony and his regulations are treated of in the *Acta Sanctor.* ad diem 17 Januarii, tom. ii. p. 107.

⁶ See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana*, tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 48, &c.

⁷ The majority follow Baronius, maintaining that it was St. Athanasius who, about the year 340, transplanted the monastic institution from Egypt into Italy, and erected the first monastery at Rome. See Mabillon, *Prefatio ad Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* tom. i. p. 9, &c. But Lud. Ant. Muratori opposes this opinion, and contends that the first European monastery was built at Milan. *Antiq. Italicar. mediæ ævi*, tom. v. p. 364.

Again, Just. Fontinanus, in his *Historia Litterar. Aquileiens.* p. 155, &c. maintains that the first society of monks was collected at Aquileia. None of these writers adduced unexceptionable proof. The first convent of nuns was erected at Verona, near the close of this century, and by Zeno the bishop of Verona, if we may give credit to the brothers Ballerini, in their *Diss. II. ad Zenonem Veronens.* p. 115, &c.

⁸ See Sulpitius Severus, *de Vita Martin.* cap. x. p. 17, ed. Veron. where the mode of life adopted by these Martinian monks is particularly described. See also the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. i. pt. ii. p. 42, and others.

bound by the hard and severe rules to which the latter submitted. For our part of the world is not so filled with persons who are by nature sour, morose, delirious, and fanatical, as those oriental regions are; nor will our bodies endure that abstemiousness in regard to nourishment which those will which were born under a dry and burning atmosphere. It was, therefore, rather the name and the shadow of that solitary life which *Antony* and others instituted in the East, than the thing itself, which was brought into the countries of Europe⁹.

§ 15. These monks¹ were not all of the same kind; for first, they were divided into *Canobites* and *Eremites*. The former lived and ate together in the same house, and were associated under a leader and head, whom they called *Father*, or in the Egyptian tongue, *Abbot*². The latter, the *Eremites*, led a

⁹ This difference between the oriental and the occidental monks, as to their mode of living, and the cause of it, are pleasantly noticed by Sulpitius Severus, *Dial. i. de Vita Martini*, c. 2, p. 65, ed. Verona. One of the interlocutors having described the dry and sparing diet of the Egyptian monks, Sulpitius turned to his Gallic friend, and said: "How would you like a bunch of herbs and half a loaf, as a dinner for five men? He, reddening a little on being so rallied, replied: You are at your old practice, Sulpitius, for you neglect no opportunity that occurs to tax us [Gallic monks] with voracity. But it is cruel in you to require us Gauls to live in the manner of angels. But let that Cyrenian [monk] content himself with such a dinner, since it is his necessity or nature to go hungry.—We, as I have often told you, are Gauls." In the same dialogue, cap. 4, p. 69, 70, he taxes Jerome with accusing the monks of edacity, and goes on to say: "I perceive that he refers rather to the oriental monks, than to the occidental; for edacity in the Greeks [and orientals] is gluttony; in the Gauls it is nature." Immediately, therefore, on the introduction of the monastic institution into Europe, the occidental monks differed widely from the oriental in their customs and mode of living, and were taxed by them with voraciousness and gluttony.

¹ [The word monk, (*μοναχός*, from *μονάζειν*, to live alone,) first occurs in the fourth century, and is kindred with *ascetic* [*ἀσκητής*, from *ἀσκήω*, to practise,

to exercise.] At least, the monks were also called *ascetics*; though all ascetics were not monks: for the name *ascetic* denotes a Christian who devotes himself to severe religious exercises, and particularly to abstinence and fasting. Such ascetics have always existed among Christians; but these were not always monks. The word *ascetic* is a generic term; the word *monk* denotes a species under that genus. This is conceded by the Catholics, Valesius (notes on Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* l. xi. c. 17, and *de Martyr. Palest.* c. 11) and by Pagi, *Critica in Annot. Baronii*, ad ann. 62, § 4, tom. i. p. 48.—The males among the monks were called *Monachi*, and the females *Monache*. See Jerome, *Ep.* 18, ad Eustoch. Opp. tom. iv. pt. ii. p. 34, ed. Martianay. Erasmus derives the term *monnus* from the Egyptian language; Gerh. Jo. Vossius derives it from the Hebrew, מוֹנֵן, a son; de Vitiliis *Sermonis*, l. i. c. 6, p. 9, l. ii. c. 13; de Orig. *Idolol.* l. i. c. 24. *Schl.*]

² [The *canobites* derived their name from [*καινόβιον*] *canobium*, (*καίνος* *βίος*.) a habitation in which several monks lived together. The ancients discriminated between a *canobium* and a *monastery*. The latter was the residence of proper and solitary monks; the former, of associated monks, who lived together in a society. The habitation of a single, solitary monk, might be called a *monastery*, but not a *canobium*. See Cassianus, *Collat.* xviii. c. 10, Opp. p. 525, and compare Jerome, *Ep.* 95, ad Rusticium

cheerless, solitary life, in certain parts of the country, dwelling in hovels among the wild beasts³. Still more austere than the Eremites, were those who were called *Anchorites*. These lived in desert places, with no kind of shelter; fed on roots and plants; and had no fixed residence, but lodged wherever night overtook them, so that visitors might not know where to find them⁴. The last class of monks were the *Vagrants*, called by the Egyptians, *Sarabaitæ*, who roamed about the provinces, and from city to city, and got their living without labour, by pretended miracles, by trafficking in relics, and by other impositions⁵. Among the *Cenobites*, many were vicious and profligate; but not so many as among the *Sarabaites*, most of whom were men without integrity or worth of any kind. The *Eremites* were generally delirious fanatics, whose understandings were at fault⁶. All of them originally were no members of the clerical order, but *laymen* under the care and protection of the bishops. But many of them were admitted into the rank of *clergymen*, even by the command of the emperors; and so great was their reputation for sanctity, that bishops were often chosen from among them⁷.

monachum; Opp. tom. iv. pt. ii. p. 775, and Gregory Naz. *Orat.* xxi. Opp. tom. i. p. 384.—The *nuns* also had their presidents, who were called *Mothers*. See Jerome, *Ep.* 20, Opp. tom. iv. pt. ii. p. 51. See also Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiast.* vol. iii. p. 63. *Schl.*]

³ [From a passage in the beginning of the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius, it may be inferred, that in the most ancient times the *eremites* and the *anchorites* were the same; for he speaks of the ἀναχωρητῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. But, subsequently, a distinction was made between them. *Schl.*—The terms *monks*, *eremites*, and *anchorites*, or *anachorites*, were, at first, all used as synonymous; and were applied indiscriminately to those Egyptian *ascetics* who ἀναχωρεῖσθαι retired from the world, and lived solitary, μοναχοί (from μόνος, alone), in the wilderness, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, for the sake of practising (ἀσκεῖν) religious exercises without interruption. The words *ascetic* and *monk* continued to be generic, and were applied to all who devoted themselves to a religious life, and subjected themselves to strict rules of living. The other terms required more appropriate significations, when the monks became

distributed into various classes or sorts. *Tr.*]

⁴ See Sulpitius Severus, *Dial.* i. de *Vita Martini*, c. ix. p. 80, &c. ed. Verona. [When several anchorites lived in the same wilderness, only a little separated from each other, they were collectively called a *Laura*. See Evagrius, *Historia Eccles.* l. i. c. 21, and Valesius, note on this passage. See also Walch's *Hist. Eccles. Nor. Test.* p. 1670. *Schl.*]

⁵ [Concerning the *Sarabites*, see Jo. Cassianus, *Collat.* xviii. c. 7, Opp. p. 731, &c. and the notes of Gazeus there. *Tr.*—Their name appears derivable from the Hebrew סרב, *Sarab*, refractory. *Ed.*]

⁶ On the vices of the monks of this century, see Sulpitius Severus, *Dial.* i. de *Vita Martini*, cap. viii. p. 69, 70, cap. xxi. p. 83, where he chastises in particular the pride of those who coveted the honours of clergymen. *Dial.* ii. c. viii. p. 112. *Dial.* iii. c. xv. p. 144, 145, also the *Consultatio Apollonii et Zachari*, published by Lau. Dachery, in *Spicileg.* tom. i. l. iii. c. 3. p. 35, &c.

⁷ See Jā. Godefroi, on the *Codex Theodos.* tom. vi. pt. i. p. 76, 106. ed. Ritter.

§ 16. To these defects in the moral system of the age, must be added two principal errors now almost publicly adopted, and from which afterwards immense evils resulted. The first was, that to *deceive and lie is a virtue*, when religion can be promoted by it. The other was, that *errors in religion*, when maintained after proper admonition, ought to be visited with *penalties and punishments*. The first of these principles had been embraced in the preceding centuries; and it is almost incredible, what a mass of the most insipid fables, and what a host of pious falsehoods have through all the centuries grown out of it, to the great detriment of true religion. If some inquisitive person were to examine the conduct and the writings of the greatest and most pious teachers of this century, I fear that he would find about all of them infected with this leprosy. I cannot except *Ambrose*, nor *Hilary*, nor *Augustine* nor *Gregory Nazianzen*, nor *Jerome*. And perhaps it was this same fault, that led *Salpilius Severus*, who was in other respects no incompetent historian, to ascribe so many miracles to *St. Martin*. The other principle, from the very time when *Constantine* gave peace and security to the Christians, was approved by many: in the conflicts with the *Priscillianists* and *Donatists*, it was corroborated by examples, and unequivocally sanctioned by the authority of *Augustine*, and transmitted down to succeeding ages.

§ 17. If we look at the lives and morals of Christians, we shall find, as heretofore, that good were commingled with bad; yet the number of the bad began gradually to increase, so that men truly pious and godly were more rarely seen. When there was nothing any longer to be feared from enemies without; when the character of most bishops was tarnished with arrogance, luxury, effeminacy, animosity, resentments, and other defects; when the lower clergy neglected their proper duties, and were more attentive to idle controversies than to the promotion of piety and the instruction of the people; when vast numbers were induced, not by a rational conviction, but by the fear of punishment, and the hope of worldly advantage, to enrol themselves as Christians; how can it surprise us, that on all sides the vicious appeared a host, and the pious a little band almost overpowered by them? Against the flagitious, and those guilty of heinous offences, the same rules for penance were prescribed, as before the reign of *Constantine*.

But as the times continually waxed worse, the more honourable and powerful could sin with impunity, and only the poor and the unfortunate felt the severity of the laws.

§ 18. This century was fruitful in controversies among Christians; for, as is common with mankind, external peace made room for internal discords and contentions. We shall here mention the more considerable ones which did not give rise to obstinate heresies. In Egypt, soon after the century began, or about the year 306, commenced the long continued schism, which from the author of it was called the *Meletian* controversy. *Peter*, the bishop of Alexandria, deposed *Meletius*, the bishop of Lycopolis in Thebais. The cause is involved in uncertainty. The friends of *Peter* represent *Meletius* as one who had sacrificed to the gods, and had committed other crimes¹. Others report him to have been guilty of no other offence, than that of excessive severity against the lapsed². *Meletius* disregarded the sentence of Peter, and not only continued to exercise the functions of his office, but assumed to himself the power of consecrating presbyters; a right which, according to established usage in Egypt, belonged exclusively to the bishop of Alexandria. The partizans of this serious and eloquent man were numerous; and at length not a few of the monks espoused his cause. The Nicene council attempted in vain to heal this breach³. The *Meletians*, on the contrary, whose chief aim was to oppose the authority claimed by the bishop of Alexandria, afterwards joined themselves to his great enemies, namely, the Arians⁴. Thus a contest which at first

¹ Athanasius, *Apologia secunda*; Opp. tom. i. p. 777, &c.

² Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxviii. Opp. tom. i. p. 716, &c. See Dion. Petavius, note on *Epiphanius*. tom. ii. p. 274; and Sam. Basnage, *Exercitatio de Rebus Sacris contra Baronium*, p. 305, &c.

³ [The attempt of this council is worthy of particular attention, because from it may be drawn a conclusion which is in opposition to the statement of Athanasius. If Meletius had really sacrificed to idols, as Athanasius represents, the council would not have treated him so mildly as they actually did. Socrates (*Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 9.) has preserved the epistle of the fathers assembled at Nice, which they addressed to the church of Alexandria, and the Egyptian Christians. In this epistle they say, they had

decreed that Meletius should remain in his city, but should have no power either to perform ordination or to appoint teachers, nor should he appear either in the country or in any town for such an object; but still that he should retain the title of bishop. The sixth canon of this council refers also to this subject. "The existing laws in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, shall hereafter be observed; that the bishop of Alexandria shall have the oversight of all these—and if any one shall be made a bishop, without the previous consent of the metropolitan, he shall not hold the office." See Mansi, *Collectio Amplius Conciliorum*. tom. ii. p. 670; and the younger Walch's *Ketzerhistorie*, vol. iv. p. 335, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ [See the younger Walch's *Ketzerhistorie*, vol. iv. p. 393, &c. *Schl.*]

related only to the limits of the Alexandrian bishop's powers became, through the influence of heated passions, a controversy respecting an article of faith. The Meletian party was still existing in the fifth century³.

³ Soerates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 6. Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 8. [On the history of this controversy, it is proper to remark, in general, that some reject altogether the account which is given of it by Epiphanius, regarding the account of Athanasius as more worthy of credit. This is the prevailing opinion in the Roman Catholic church. Others consider the account of Epiphanius as most worthy to be received, for the following reasons:—1. Epiphanius was prepossessed in favour of neither party. He speaks respectfully of the bishops opposed to Meletius, and he censures the Meletians with caution. 2. On the contrary, Athanasius was a strenuous foe to the Meletians, and every where shows his bitter hatred of them. 3. Yet he mentions the crime of Meletius but once, and then very concisely. The subsequent writers, who were more free from the heat of passion, do not follow him exactly. Only Soerates coincides with him. Theodoret omits the circumstance of Meletius's fall. Sozomen is wholly silent about it. Yet it is not probable that these writers, who were by no means partial to the Meletians, would have so deviated from Athanasius, if they had held his statement to be uncontrovertible. 4. Epiphanius is not inclined to say favourable things of other sectarians without good reason; and the evil which Athanasius had said of Meletius, could not probably have been unknown to him. 5. The statement of Epiphanius has too much self-consistency for a fabrication. 6. What Epiphanius states of the views of bishop Peter in regard to admitting the lapsed to communion, agrees with the fourteenth and fifteenth canons of this bishop; on which, see Fabricius, *Biblioth. Gr.* vol. viii. p. 411, and Tillemont, *tom. v.* p. 450, &c. 7. It is incomprehensible that the Nicene fathers should have treated Meletius so indulgently, if they regarded the accusation of Athanasius as well founded. 8. As the Meletians were so strict in their intercourse with the lapsed, it is inconceivable that they could receive for their leader any person who had been guilty of a fall of the grossest kind. There are others who

are undecided, and not established in their judgment. Sam. Basnage, in his *Exercit. Antibarbar.* referred to above in note⁹, declares the accusation of Athanasius, in regard to the idolatrous sacrifice, to be false; and in his *Annales Politico-ecclesiast.* tom. ii. p. 608, &c. he rejects the account of Epiphanius. Dr. Baumgarten, in his *Auszug der Kirchengesch.* vol. ii. p. 681, gives the preference to the statement of Athanasius; but in his *Geschichte der Religionsparteien*, p. 506, he follows Epiphanius exclusively. Even Mosheim, in the first edition of his *Institutes of Christian Church History*, p. 253, says: "Notwithstanding the objections of Petavius, perhaps the statement of Epiphanius is the most correct." But in the new edition, this remark is omitted. Also in his lectures, during his last years, he expressed himself dubiously, without declaring for either party. The most full and soundly critical examination of the Meletian controversy, is that of Dr. Walsh, in his *Historie der Ketzereien*, vol. iv. p. 355—410. He also remarks, from Tillemont, vol. v. p. 455, that likewise one Meletius of Syria caused a schism, which, in its consequences, was more important than the preceding; and that Erasmus and Præteolus confound the two schisms. After the council of Nice, Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, very strenuously opposed the progress of Arian doctrines, and was therefore deprived of his office; and another was elected in his place who was more favourable to the Arians; and after him succeeded others, all holding Arian sentiments. The last of these was Eudoxius, who was removed to Constantinople on the deposition of Macedonius, bishop of that city (A.D. 360). Meletius, of Syria, was now chosen bishop of Antioch by a council. He had before been bishop of Sebaste, and the heads of the Arian party supposed him to hold the Arian sentiments. He at least held communion with Arians, and had by his virtuous life obtained a high reputation. At first Meletius concealed his sentiments, and in his public discourses treated only on practical subjects. But as one part of his hearers were orthodox, and the other part

§ 19. Not long after Meletius, one *Eustathius* excited great commotions in Armenia, Pontus, and the neighbouring countries; and was therefore condemned in the council of *Gangra*, which was held not long after the Nicene council. Whether this man was *Eustathius* the bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, or whether the ancients confounded two persons of the same name, is debated with about equal weight of argument on both

Arians, he did not long leave them in uncertainty, but acknowledged to them his conviction of the correctness of the Nicene faith. This acknowledgment was the source of much suffering to Meletius. The Arians resented it very highly, that he should disappoint their expectations; and as he would not retract, they deprived him of his office, A.D. 362, by the aid of the emperor Constantius, and banished him from the country. Meletius now left Antioch and went to his native city Melitene. In his place, Euzoius, one of the oldest friends of Arius, was appointed. But the orthodox, who would not acknowledge him as a bishop, now wholly ceased to worship with the Arians, which they had done up to this time. Thus there were now three parties at Antioch. The Arians who acknowledged Euzoius for their bishop; the Eustathians, who ever since the deposition of Eustathius, (A.D. 327,) whom they regarded as the legitimate bishop of Antioch, had ceased to worship with the Arians, and held their separate meetings without making disturbance: and the Meletians, who were the majority, and who acknowledged Meletius for the legitimate bishop. The Meletians were willing to unite with the Eustathians, on condition that they would look upon Meletius as themselves did. But the Eustathians refused to do so, and would not acknowledge the Meletians for brethren, because they considered both them and their bishop as not pure enough from the Arian infection. Athanasius, Eusebius of Verecelli, and Lucifer attempted to reconcile these divisions. Lucifer (A.D. 362.) consecrated a new bishop of Antioch; whom, however, the Eustathians only would receive. Meletius now came back to Antioch; and thus there were two bishops of Antioch, Paulinus, (the Eustathian bishop,) and Meletius; and the difficulties were increased, rather than settled, by the procedure of Lucifer. The foreign bishops took part in this controversy.

Athanasius looked on Paulinus as the most orthodox, and therefore he and the greater part of the West took the side of Paulinus. The eastern bishops were on the side of Meletius; who was exiled by the emperor Valens, but returned after that emperor's death, and suddenly died. (A.D. 381.) The Greek and the Latin churches enrolled him among the saints after his death. As respects the Latin church, this was a very extraordinary transaction. Meletius died entirely out of communion with the Romish see; and yet he is numbered among their saints! Either the pope then must be not infallible, or the Romish church worships as saints persons who, according to her own principles, are unworthy of worship. The death of Meletius did not restore peace at Antioch. The Meletians, instead of acknowledging Paulinus for a legitimate bishop, elected Flavianus, an orthodox and irreproachable character, for a successor to Meletius. This Flavianus was supported by the bishops of Syria, Palestine, Phœnicia, Cappadocia, Galatia, the lesser Asia, and Thrace; on the side of Paulinus were the bishops of Rome and Italy, and of Egypt and Arabia, who wished for the deposition of Flavianus. Paulinus died (in 389); but instead of giving peace to the church, influenced probably by a fanatical obstinacy, he consecrated over his little party, before his death, one Evagrius as his successor. Soon after (A.D. 393.) Evagrius died; but the disunion still continued. Finally, through the prudence and the peace-making temper of Chrysostom, peace and ecclesiastical communion between the two parties were restored. Flavianus was acknowledged by the foreign bishops as the bishop of Antioch. Yet there remained a little handful of Eustathians, who did not unite with the general church till Flavianus was succeeded by other bishops. See Wadch, *Ketzschistorie*, vol. iv. p. 410—502. *Schell.*

sides⁴. The founder of the Eustathian sect is charged, not so much with unsoundness in the faith, as with ill-advised piety. For he is said not only to have prohibited marriage, eating flesh, love-feasts and the like, but also to have recommended divorce to married persons, and to have granted to children and servants the liberty of violating the commands of their parents and masters, under pretext of religion⁵.

§ 20. *Lucifer*, bishop of *Cagliari* in Sardinia, a man of decision, sternness, and vigour, who was driven into exile by the emperor *Constantius*, for defending the Nicene doctrine of three persons in one God, first separated from *Eusebius*, bishop of *Vercelli*, in the year 363, because the latter was displeased at his consecration of *Paulinus* to preside over the church of *Antioch*; and afterwards separated himself from the communion of the whole church, because it had decreed that absolution might be granted to those bishops, who under *Constantius* had deserted to the Arians⁶. At least this is certain, that

⁴ See Sam. Basnage, *Annales Politico-Ecclesiast.* tom. ii. p. 340, &c.

⁵ Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 43. Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iii. c. 14, l. ii. c. 24. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lvi. p. 910. Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iii. c. 16. Wolff, Gundling, *Notæ ad Concilium Gangræse*, p. 9, &c.—[The younger Walch, in his *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. iii. p. 536—577, has treated circumstantially and solidly, concerning the Eustathians. See also his *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 216, &c. The chief sources for a history of the Eustathians, are the documents of the council of *Gangra*, consisting of a synodical epistle, and twenty canons. From these sources both Socrates and Sozomen derived their information. The author of the *Life of St. Basil*, which is prefixed to the third vol. of the works of *Basil*, maintains, (ch. v. § 4, &c.) that the founder of this party was not Eustathius, but rather Aërius; and also that the persons with whom the council of *Gangra* had to do, should not be called Eustathians, but Aërians. But the arguments are not so powerful as to compel a reflecting reader to abandon the common opinion. Whether the bishop of *Sebaste* in *Armenia*, who is so famous in the history of the Arian heresy, and who had some connexion with Aërius, or another Eustathius, was the origin of this controversy, cannot be determined

with certainty. Yet the arguments for the first supposition seem to preponderate. This Eustathius was a pupil of Aërius, and a lover of monkery. Many different councils passed their judgment on him, some putting him down, and others regarding him as a valuable man. He has been accused of instability in his belief; but he seems properly to have been a semi-Arian. His character is described to us by some impartial writers, as being very commendable. The synodical epistle of the council of *Gangra* is addressed to the bishops of *Armenia*, and censures various faults, which for the most part relate to monkish usages: and the canons enjoin the opposite of the new regulations. The Eustathians condemned matrimony, because they maintained that a married lady, though pious, could not be saved, if she continued to cohabit with her husband. They forbade eating flesh, or receiving the holy supper from a married priest, on pain of forfeiting salvation. They condemned the building erected for public worship, and held their meetings in private. They allowed a woman to forsake her husband, parents, their children, and children their parents, on pretence of devoting themselves to a stricter mode of life, &c. *Seld.*]

⁶ Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 30. Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iii. c. 9. See also Tillenmont, *Mémoires pour servir à*

the little company of his followers, or the *Luciferians*, would have no intercourse with the bishops who had joined themselves to the Arian sect, nor with those who had pardoned these bishops after confessing their fault; and thus they renounced the whole church⁷. They are likewise reported to have held erroneous sentiments respecting the human soul, viewing it as generated from the bodies of the parents, or as transfused by the parents into their children⁸.

§ 21. About the same time, or not much after, *Aërius*, a presbyter, monk, and semi-Arian, rent Armenia, Pontus, and Cappadocia, by opinions wide of those commonly received, and thus founded a sect. First, he maintained that, by divine appointment⁹, there was no difference between bishops and presbyters. Yet it is not very clear, how far he carried this sentiment; though it is certain, that it was very pleasing to many who were disgusted with the pride of the bishops of that age. In the next place, *Aërius* disapproved of prayers for the dead, the stated fasts, the celebration of Easter, and other things,

l'Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. vii. p. 521. ed. Paris:—[and, above all others, Walch, *Historie der Ketzerzeu*, vol. iii. p. 338—377. From him, we shall enlarge the account given by Dr. Mosheim. When the orthodox party under Constantius, after the adverse result to them of the council of Arles, found themselves in great danger, and were deliberating about requesting the emperor to summon a new council, Lucifer proceeded to Rome, and being constituted envoy of the Romish bishop Liberius, he thence repaired to the imperial court in Gaul, and obtained of the emperor the council of Milan; by which, however, the emperor intended to further his own purposes. And as Lucifer was one of those who in that council zealously espoused the cause of the orthodox, he fell under the emperor's displeasure, and was sent among others into banishment. When the death of the emperor left him at liberty to return from exile, he became involved in the Meletian controversy at Antioch, and this occasioned his falling out with Eusebius, bishop of Verceili. For he led on and consecrated the aged Paulinus, bishop, which Eusebius greatly disapproved; because, according to the decrees of the council held at Alexandria by Athanasius, he with Lucifer was commissioned to heal the division

at Antioch, which was now widened still more by the unwise step of Lucifer. The same council had also decreed, that the Arian bishops, after acceding to the Nicene creed, might be received into the church and remain in their offices. But the refusal of Eusebius to approve of the proceedings of Lucifer at Antioch, and the mild regulations of the Alexandrian council respecting those he accounted apostate bishops, which he could by no means approve, induced him to break off all church communion with such as approved those regulations: and thence arose the schism which bears his name. After this separation, he continued to exercise his functions at Cagliari for nine years, and at last died at an advanced age. *Schli.*—See, for account of his writings, Note, p. 343. *Tr.*]

⁷ See the *petition* addressed to Theodosius, by Marcellinus and Faustinus, two Luciferians, in the Works of Is. Sirmond, tom. ii. p. 229, &c.

⁸ See Augustine, *de Hæres.* c. 81; and on that passage, Lamb. Damascus, p. 346. [This account is very uncertain; and Augustine himself does not state it as a matter of certainty. See Walch, l. c. p. 368. *Schli.*]

⁹ *Jure divino.*

which most persons regarded as the very soul of religion¹. He seems to have aimed to reduce religion to its primitive simplicity: a design which, in itself considered, was laudable; though in the motives and the mode of proceeding, there were perhaps some things censurable.

§ 22. There were other persons of this character in the fourth century, who looked with disgust on the progress of superstition, and of errors respecting the true nature of religion, and who opposed the general current; but received as the only reward of their labour, to be branded with infamy. Eminent among them was *Jovinian*, an Italian monk, who taught first at Rome, and then at Milan, near the close of the century, and persuaded many, that all persons whatsoever, if they keep the vows they made to Christ in baptism, and live godly lives, have an equal title to the rewards of heaven; so that those who spent their lives in celibacy, or macerated their bodies by

¹ Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxv. p. 905, &c. Augustine, *de Hæres.* c. 53, and some others. [The last is not a witness of much weight. He had no acquaintance with the Aërians, but took one part of his statement from Epiphanius, (*ubi supra*;) and the other from Philastrius, *de Hæres.* c. 72, p. 140. Epiphanius had it in his power to get, and did get, better information respecting the oriental controversies, than Philastrius could. The latter speaks of Aërius, as one unknown to him; the former, as one whose history he well knew, and who was then alive. Epiphanius knew the Eueratites very well, and he distinguishes them from the Aërians; but Philastrius confounds them. Aërius was a native of Pontus, or of the lesser Armenia, an eloquent man, and a friend of the well-known semi-Arian Eustathius, afterwards bishop of Sebaste, with whom he lived at the same time among the monks. The elevation of Eustathius to the see of Sebaste, first awakened envy in Aërius, he having himself aspired after that promotion. To allay that feeling, Eustathius made his friend a presbyter, and committed to his care the superintendence of a house for the reception of strangers. But the good understanding between them was of short continuance. Aërius could be restrained by nothing from his restless conduct towards his bishop, whom he accused of avarice and misappropriation of the funds for the poor. At last, they came

to a breach. Aërius abandoned his office and his hospital, and acquired many adherents, to whom none would show indulgence, as the disposition to persecute was then almost universal among the clergy. Aërius maintained, that in the times of the apostles, there was no difference between a bishop and a presbyter; and this he solidly proved from passages in Paul. He was not disposed to abolish the human rights of bishops, but only to rescue the presbyters from episcopal oppression, in the exercise of their legitimate functions. He held the prayers and the alms of the living for the dead, to be useless and dangerous; and discarded the regular, prescribed, Christian fasts on certain days. The festival of Easter he did not wholly discard, as it is commonly supposed, but only the ceremony of slaying a lamb at Easter, which according to ancient custom was practised by some Christians. This appears from the argument by which he supported his opinion. For he says, "Christians should keep no *Passover*, because Paul declares Christ, who was slain for us, to be *our Paschal Lamb*." This reasoning would be insipid, if Aërius proposed by it to put down altogether the whole festival of Easter. Aërius was therefore in the right, and his opposers in the wrong. Only his obstinacy in pushing matters to a schism is blamable. See the younger Waleh, *Historie der Ketzer-eyen*, vol. iii. p. 321—338. *Schl.*]

fasting, were no more acceptable to God than those who lived in wedlock, and nourished their bodies with moderation and sobriety. These sentiments were first condemned by the church of Rome, and then by *Ambrose*, in a council held at Milan in the year 390². The emperor *Honorius* enacted penal laws against those holding such sentiments, and *Jovinian* he banished to the island Boa³. *Jovinian* published his opinions in a book, against which *St. Jerome*, in the following century, wrote a most bitter and abusive treatise, which is still extant.

§ 23. Of all the religious controversies⁴, those concerning *Origen* made the greatest noise and continued the longest. Though *Origen* had long been accused of many errors, yet hitherto most Christians had regarded his name with veneration. But now the Arians, cunningly looking on every side for support, maintained that this great man had been of their party. Some believed them, and therefore indulged the same hatred towards *Origen* as towards the Arians. Yet some of the most eminent and best informed men resisted the charge, and strove to vindicate the reputation of their master against these aspersions. Among these, *Eusebius*, bishop of Caesarea, stood pre-eminent, in consequence of his written *Apology for Origen*. And, I believe, this storm raised against the honour of a man, to whom the whole Christian world paid respect, would have soon subsided, if new commotions had not arisen, which proceeded from another source.

² Hieronymus in *Jovinianum*, Opp. tom. ii. Augustine, *de Hæres.* c. 82. Ambrose, *Ep.* vi. &c. [Jovinian lived at Rome, when he advanced the doctrines which were so strenuously opposed. Yet it is uncertain, whether Rome or Milan was his native place. He was not unmarried, and he lived a single life. To the preceding doctrines of Jovinian, the following may be added: that Mary ceased to be a virgin, by bringing forth Christ; which some denied;—that the degrees of future blessedness do not depend on the meritoriousness of our good works;—and that a truly converted Christian, so long as he is such, cannot sin wilfully, but will so resist the temptations of the devil, as not to be overcome by him. For these doctrines, Jovinian was accused by some Christians at Rome, before Siricius the Roman bishop. A council was assembled by Siricius, by which Jovinian was con-

demned and excommunicated. He then retired, with his friends, to Milan. There they were condemned, by a council which Ambrose assembled. By such persecution, the party was soon crushed. See Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. iii. p. 635—682. Schl.]

³ *Codex Theodosianus*, tom. iii. p. 218, tom. vi. p. 193.—[This law is dated in the year 412. But according to the representation of Jerome, Jovinian must, in the year 406, have been dead some considerable time. The law therefore must have been aimed against altogether a different person—and there appear in it no traces of the complaints brought against Jovinian—or the date of it must be erroneous, as was conjectured by Tillamont, tom. x. p. 229. 753. See Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. iii. p. 664, &c. Schl.]

⁴ [Among the orthodox. Tr.]

§ 24. All the monks, and especially those of Egypt, were enthusiastic admirers of *Origen*; and they spared no pains to disseminate every where the opinions which they imbibed from him. Yet they could not persuade all to believe that those opinions were sound and correct. Hence arose, at first, a concealed disagreement as to the reasonableness of the doctrines of *Origen*, which gradually increased till it burst into an open flame. Among many others, *John*, bishop of Jerusalem, was in favour of *Origen*; and as *Epiphanius* and *Jerome* were, from other causes, hostile to *John*, they endeavoured to excite odium against him on this ground. He defended himself in such a way as, at the same time, to protect the reputation of *Origen*; and thus he had the whole swarm of monks and innumerable others on his side. From this beginning followed those vehement contests respecting the doctrines of *Origen*, which pervaded both the East and the West. In the West they were fomented especially by *Rufinus*, a presbyter of Aquileia, who translated some of *Origen's* books into Latin, and showed, not obscurely, that he was pleased with the sentiments that those books contained⁵. He therefore incurred the implacable wrath of *Jerome*. But at length, *Rufinus* being dead, and men of high reputation in the West opposing the progress of Origenism, both by their influence and their writings, these commotions seemed to subside in the West.

§ 25. In the East, far greater troubles came upon the church on account of Origenism. *Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria, who was for various reasons hostile to some of the monks of Scetys or Nitria, taxed them with their Origenism, and ordered them to throw away the books of *Origen*. The monks resisted his command; alleging, sometimes, that the objectionable passages in the writings of that holy man were interpolations of the heretics, and sometimes, that it was improper to condemn the whole together, on account of a few passages which might be justly censurable. *Theophilus*, therefore, having assembled a council at Alexandria in the year 399, which condemned the Origenists, with an armed force drove the monks from the mountain of Nitria. They fled first to Jerusalem, and thence removed to Scythopolis; but finding

⁵ See especially Just. Fontaninus, *Historia Litteraria Aquileiens.* lib. iv. c. 3, &c. p. 177, &c., where he gives an elaborate history of Rufinus.

themselves insecure there likewise, they set sail for Constantinople, intending to lay their cause before the imperial court⁶. The remainder of their history belongs to the next century. But it is proper to remark, that those who are denominated *Origenists* in the writings of this age, were not all of one character. For this ambiguous term sometimes denotes merely a person friendly to *Origen*, who looked upon his books as corrupted, and did not defend the errors of which he was accused: but at other times, it designates those persons who admitted that *Origen* taught all that he was charged with teaching, and who resolutely defended his opinions. Of this latter class were many of the monks.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES AND RITES.

§ 1, 2. Ceremonies multiplied.—§ 3. Form of public worship.—§ 4. Some parts of it changed.—§ 5. Festal days.—§ 6. Fasts.—§ 7. Administration of baptism.—§ 8. and of the Lord's supper.

§ 1. WHILE the good-will of the emperors aimed to advance the Christian religion, the indiscreet piety of the bishops obscured its true nature and oppressed its energies, by the multiplication of rites and ceremonies. The observation of *Augustine* is well known, That the yoke once laid upon the Jews, was more supportable than that laid on many Christians in his age¹. For the Christian bishops introduced, with but slight alterations, into the Christian worship, those rites and institutions by which, formerly, the Greeks and Romans and others had manifested their piety and reverence towards their imaginary deities; supposing that the people would more readily embrace Christianity, if they perceived the rites handed down to them from their fathers, still existing unchanged among the Christians,

⁶ See Peter Dan. Huet, *Origéniana*, lib. ii. cap. 4, p. 196, &c. Ludov. Doucin, *Histoire de l'Origénisme*, liv. iii. p. 95, &c. Hieron. a Prato, Diss. vi. in Sulpitium Severum de Monachis ob *Origenis* nomen ex Nitria totaque *Ægypto* pulsus, 273, Veron. 1741, fol. These

writers cite the ancient authorities; but they make some mistakes. [The literary history of this controversy is given by the senior Walch, *Historia Eccles. N. T.* p. 1042, &c. *Schl.*]

¹ *Augustine, Epist. 119, ad Januarium*, according to the ancient division.

and saw, that *Christ* and the martyrs were worshipped in the same manner as formerly their gods were. There was, accordingly, little difference in these times between the public worship of the Christians and that of the Greeks and Romans. In both there were splendid robes, mitres, tiaras, wax-tapers, crosiers², processions, lustrations, images, golden and silver vases, and innumerable other things.

§ 2. No sooner had *Constantine* renounced the religion of his ancestors, than magnificent temples were every where erected, adorned with pictures and images, and both in external and internal form very similar to the fanes and temples of the gods³. These temples were of two kinds. Some were erected at the graves of the *martyrs*, and were called *Martyria*: the people assembled in these only at stated times. Others were dedicated to the ordinary and common meetings for religious worship, and were afterwards called by the Latins *Tituli*⁴. Both were consecrated with great pomp and with rites bor-

² [The *crosier*, or *bishop's staff*, was exactly of the form of the *titulus*, the chief ensign of the ancient *Augurs*. See Cicero, *de Divinatione*, l. i. c. 17. Tr.]

³ See Ezek. Spanheim, *Præces sur les Césars de Julien*, p. 47; but especially, Peter Le Brun, *Explication littérale et histor. des cérémonies de la Messe*, tome ii. p. 101, &c. For a description of such a temple, see Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini Magni*, l. iii. c. 35, &c. Plates representing the interior form, are given by Wm. Beveridge, *Adnotat. ad Pandectas Canonum*, tom. ii. p. 70, and by Fred. Spanheim, *Institut. Hist. Eccles.* in his *Opp.* tom. i. p. 860. Some parts of the Christian temples were after the pattern of the Jewish temple. See Camp. Vitringa, *de Synagoga Veteri*, lib. iii. p. 466. [Some of these temples were new buildings, erected by the emperors; others were pagan temples transmuted to Christian churches. See *Code Théodos.* lib. ix. tit. xvii. legem 2; and *Jerome's Chronicle*, ann. 332. From the Jews were borrowed, the division into the holy of holies, the holy place and the court; from which came the Chancel, the Nave, and the Porch, *Βήμα, ναός*, and *ναὸς*; *Schl.*]

⁴ John Mabillon, *Museum Italic.* tom. ii. in *Comment. ad Ordin. Roman.* p. xvi. &c. [*Tituli* appear to have been ordinary churches, as distinguished from

the principal churches, now called cathedrals. The term, as thus used, is very ancient in Rome, and appears in England so early as 787, being found in the sixth canon of the council of Caneuth. Its origin is not certainly known. *Titulus* is really an *inscription*, hence the inscription over our Lord's head, upon the cross, is called, from the Latin, *τίτλος* by St. John. Churches, it has been thought, were called *tituli*, either from some inscription, or other mark, which set them apart for religion, or from the tombs of the martyrs in them; tombs having been customarily called *tituli*, from the inscriptions upon them. (Du Cange, in *coe. Titul.*) Inscriptions, it seems from Ovid, (*Metam.* ix. 791,) were common in temples.

*Quid munera templis:
Adiant et titulum: titulus breve carmen
habebat.*

It may be readily therefore supposed, that *titulus*, upon the principle of *pars pro toto*, might be sometimes applied to the whole building, and so used in common speech by the ancient Christians for their churches, which took the places of the heathen temples, and were ordered very much in the same way that they had been. In this case, the *inscriptions* which gave rise to the term were either, probably, to commemorate some martyr, or for some other pious or commemorative object. *Ed.*]

rowed in great measure from the ancient laws of the Roman pontiffs. And, what is more strange, a great part of religion was supposed to consist in a multitude of churches; and the *right of patronage*, as it is called, was introduced among Christians for no other reason than to induce opulent persons to build churches⁵. Thus, in this particular, the true religion evidently copied after superstition. For the ancient nations supposed that a country or province would be the more prosperous and secure, the more temples, fânes, and chapels were there erected to the gods and heroes; because the gods could not fail to show themselves patrons and defenders of those who worshipped and honoured them with so much zeal. The same sentiment prevailed among the Christians. They supposed, the more temples there were dedicated to *Christ*, to his servants and friends, the more certain they might be of assistance from *Christ* and his friends. For they supposed God, *Christ*, and the inhabitants of heaven, equally with us wretched mortals, to be delighted and captivated with external signs and expressions of respect.

§ 3. The Christian worship consisted in hymns, prayers, reading the Holy Scriptures, a discourse to the people, and, finally, the celebration of the Lord's Supper. But these exercises were accompanied with various ceremonies, better calculated to please the eye, than to excite true devotion⁶. But all congregations did not, by any means, follow the same rule and

⁵ Just. Henn. Boehmer, *Jus Eccles. Protestant.* tom. iii. p. 466, &c. *Bibliothèque Italique*, tome v. p. 166, &c. [Whoever erected to any god either a larger or a smaller temple, had the right of designating the priests and attendants on the altar who should officiate there. And whoever erected a Christian temple, possessed the same right in regard to those who should minister there. This induced many persons to build churches. *Schl.*—Justinian formally gave a legal sanction to this principle, and with evident propriety. It is one of the first duties, of opulence to provide religious instruction for poverty. But human beings want external inducements, even to discharge admitted and obvious duties. To give men the patronage, under episcopal supervision, of churches founded out of their own resources, was to tempt them into such acts of judi-

cious piety by fair and appropriate means. Its operation in England has been to cover the whole country with ministers and houses of sound religion. Such, we may reasonably conclude, was the object of those who sought founders by the offer of patronage, not the puerile superstition of believing that heavenly favour might be won by a costly display of zeal. *Ed.*]

⁶ The form of public worship, or the *liturgy* of this age, may be very well learned in general from Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis* xxii.; and from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which are falsely ascribed to Clemens Roman. These writers are carefully explained and interpreted by Peter Le Brun, *Explication littérale et historique de la Messe*, tom. ii. p. 53, &c. which is a very learned work. [See also Dr. Ernesti's *Antimurator*, p. 13, &c. *Schl.*]

standard. Each individual bishop according to his own views, and as the circumstances of times, places, and persons suggested, prescribed to his own flock such a form of public worship as he judged best. Hence that variety of *liturgies* which were in use, before the Roman pontiff arrogated to himself supreme power in religious matters, and persuaded people that they ought to copy after the principal church, the common mother of them all, as well in doctrine as in their modes of worship.

§ 4. It would carry me too far, if I should run over all the parts of public worship: I will therefore content myself with a few observations. The prayers fell off greatly from the ancient simplicity and majesty, a considerable degree of vain inflation being admitted into them. Among the public hymns, the Psalms which David composed were now received⁷. The public discourses, among the Greeks especially, were formed according to the rules for civil eloquence; and were better adapted to call forth the admiration of the rude multitude, who love display, than to amend the heart. And that no folly and no senseless custom might be omitted in their public assemblies, the people were allowed to applaud their orators, as had been practised in forums and theatres; nay, were bidden to clap besides⁸. Who would suppose, that men professing to despise vain-glory, and who were appointed to show to others the emptiness of all human things, would become so senseless?

§ 5. The *first day of the week*, on which Christians were accustomed to meet for the worship of God, *Constantine* required, by a special law, to be observed more sacredly than before⁹.

⁷ Beausobre, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, tom. ii. p. 614, &c. [They were sung in course, or in their order. Joh. Cassianus, *Institut.* l. ii. c. 2, 4, lib. iii. c. 3. Yet for the public worship on certain occasions, particular Psalms were appointed; (Augustine, on Ps. xxi.) and it lay with the bishop to designate what Psalm he would have sung. Athanasius, *Apolog.* ii. Augustine on Ps. cxxxviii. *Schl.*]

⁸ Fran. Bernh. Ferrarius, *de Veterum Acclamationibus et Plausu*, p. 66.

⁹ Ja. Godefroi, Notes to the *Codex Theodos.* tom. i. p. 135. [See Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, lib. iv. c. 18, 19, 20, 23. Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 8. The principal laws of Constantine and

his successors, in regard to the Lord's day and the other festivals, are collected in the *Codex Justinianus*, lib. iii. tit. xii. leg. 1—11. The Lord's day and the other festivals were placed on the same level. On them all, the courts of justice and the public offices were to be closed, except in certain urgent cases. Constantine, in the year 321, required the inhabitants of cities and all mechanics to suspend their business on the Lord's day; but he allowed such as resided in the country full liberty to pursue their agriculture; because it was supposed necessary for them to sow their fields and prop their vines, when the weather and the season best suited. The emperor Leo, however, in the year

In most societies of Christians, five festal seasons were annually observed: namely, in remembrance of the Saviour's *birth*, of his sufferings and *death* for the sins of men, of his *resurrection*, of his *ascension* to heaven, and of the *descent of the Holy Ghost* upon his ministers. Of these, the fourteen days sacred to the memory of *Christ's* return to life, were observed with much more ceremony than the rest¹. The oriental Christians kept the memorial of the Saviour's *birth* and of his *baptism*, on one and the same day, namely, the *sixth* day of January; and this day they called *Epiphany*². But the occidental Christians always consecrated the 25th day of December to the memory of the Saviour's birth. For, what is reported of *Julian I.* the Roman bishop's transferring the memorial of Christ's birth from the 6th of January to the 25th of December³, appears to me very questionable. An unlucky success in finding the dead bodies of certain holy men, increased immensely *Commemorations of the martyrs*. Devout men would have readily consented to the multiplication of festivals, if the time that Christians consumed upon them had been employed in strengthening a holy frame of mind. But most people gave it up rather to idleness, pleasure, and other vices, than to God. It is well known, among other things, what opportunities of sinning were offered to the licentious, by the *Vigils*, as they were called, of *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*⁴.

§ 6. Scarcely any thing was thought more effectual to r  pel the snares of evil spirits, and appease the Deity, than *fasting*. Hence it is easy to discover, why the rulers of the church ordained fasts by express laws, and commanded that as a necessary duty, which was before left at discretion. The *Quadragesimal*⁵ *fast*, as it was called⁶, was considered more sacred than all the rest; though it was not as yet fixed to a determinate number of days⁷. But it should be remem-

469, thought agriculture required no exception; and therefore he included farmers under the same prohibition with mechanics. See Imp. Leonis *Novella*, constitut. 54. Tr.]

¹ Godefroi, Notes on the *Code Theodos.* tom. i. 143.

² See Beausobre, *Histoire du Manich  isme*, tom. ii. p. 693, &c.

³ See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana*, tom. ii. p. 164. Alph. Du Vignoles, *Dissert. in the Biblioth  que German.* tom. ii. p. 29.

⁴ [Or the nocturnal meetings, held on the nights preceding the *Paschal* and *Pentecostal* festivals. Tr.]

⁵ [Or *Lent*. Tr.]

⁶ [*Quadragesimalde*, quod appellabant *jejunium*. Lent is a word of Saxon origin, and properly means the *Spring*. The *Lent fast* is, therefore, merely the *Spring fast*, and was so called by the Anglo-Saxons to distinguish it from the fasts of other seasons. Ed.]

⁷ Joh. Dail  , de *Jejuniis et Quadragesima*, lib. iv. [The *Quadragesimal*

bered, that the fasts of this age differed much from those observed by Christians in preceding ages. Anciently, those who undertook to observe a fast, abstained altogether from food and drink; in this age, many deemed it sufficient merely to omit the use of flesh, and wine⁸: and this opinion afterwards generally prevailed among the Latins.

§ 7. For the more convenient administration of *baptism* sacred fountains, or *baptisteria*⁹, were erected in the porches of the temples. The sacred rite itself was administered, by the light of wax tapers, on the *pervigilium*, as they called it, of Easter and Whitsuntide¹. The bishop officiated, and presbyters whom he had commissioned for that purpose. In some places, salt, a symbol of purity and wisdom, was put into the mouth of the baptized; and every where, a double anointing was used, the first before, and the other after the baptism. After being baptized, the person appeared clad in white gowns during

fast was at first of only 40 hours; afterwards, it was extended to several days and even weeks; and at last settled at thirty-six. In the oriental churches, Lent commenced with the seventh week before Easter, because two days in each week they suspended the fast; but in the western churches, it commenced with the sixth week, because they fasted on the Sundays. Finally, Gregory the Great, in the sixth century, or, as others say, Gregory II. in the eighth century, added four days more to this fast, so as to make it full forty days. In the fourth century, however, the Lent Fast was in a degree optional; and the people were exhorted, with entreaties, to its observance. See Baumgarten's *Erläuterung der Christlichen Alterthüm*, p. 329, &c. Schl.]

⁸ See Joh. Barbeyrac, *de la Morale des Pères*, p. 250, &c.

⁹ [The *Baptisteries* were properly buildings adjacent to the churches, in which the catechumens were instructed, and were a sort of cisterns, into which water was let at the time of baptism, and in which the candidates were baptized by immersion. See Baumgarten's *Erläuterung der Christlichen Alterthüm*, p. 333. Schl.—See also Rob. Robertson's *History of Baptism*, ch. xii. p. 67—73. ed. Benedict, 1817. Tr.]

¹ [This must be taken as applying only to the church of Rome. In the

eastern church, in Africa, Spain, and Gaul, baptism was also administered at the great winter festival of *Theophania*, that is, in the east anciently, Jan. 6. esteemed, in some places, extremely appropriate, as passing, not only for that on which our Lord was born, but also for that on which he was baptized, and hence *revelated as God* by the visible descent upon him of the Holy Ghost. It appears by the 19th canon of a synod holden under St. Patrick, that baptism was administered in Ireland at Easter, Whitsuntide, and the Epiphany, or *Theophany*, in oriental language. Augustine, the Roman monk also, who was first archbishop of Canterbury, baptized more than 10,000 persons, in one Christmas season. (*In solennitate Dominice natiuitatis*.) Nor does pope Gregory I. who tells us this, Epp. vii. 30. say any thing against it. Of course, it is not meant, that all these numbers were baptized in a single eve, or a single day. Baptism was not, in fact, absolutely restricted to such narrow limits, but might be spread, consistently with precedent, over the whole octaves of Easter, or other festivals, besides the three great festivals. This sacrament was also administered, in some places, on the feast of St. John the Baptist. See Ballaens, *De Cultibus Religiosis Latinorum*, p. 15, Suicer, in voc. *Επιφάνεια* Labb. et Coss. *Conce*, v. 1307. Spelman, *Conce*. 58. *Ed.*]

seven days. The other rites, which were either of temporary duration, or confined to certain countries, are here omitted.

§ 8. The discipline and instruction of the *catechumens* were the same in this century as the preceding. That the *Lord's Supper* was administered twice or three times a week, (though in some places only on Sunday,) to all who assembled for the worship of God, appears from innumerable testimonies. It was also administered at the sepulchres of the martyrs, and at funerals; whence arose, afterwards, the *masses* in honour of the saints, and for the dead. The bread and wine were now every where elevated, before distribution, so that they might be seen by the people, and be viewed with reverence; and hence arose not long after, the *adoration of the symbols*. Neither *catechumens*, nor *penitents*, nor those who were supposed to be under the power of evil spirits, were allowed to be present at this sacred ordinance; nor did the sacred orators, in their public discourses, venture to speak openly and plainly concerning the true nature of it. The origin of this custom was not very honourable, as has been stated before; yet many gave an honourable reason for it, by saying, that this concealment might awaken eagerness in the *catechumens* to penetrate early into these mysteries.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THE HERESIES.

§ 1. Remains of the former sects.—§ 2, 3. Origin of the Donatist controversy.—§ 4. History of the Donatists.—§ 5, 6. Origin of the Circumcelliones.—§ 7. State of the Donatists under the emperors *Julian* and *Gratian*.—§ 8. Their principal crime.—§ 9. The doctrine of this age concerning the sacred Trinity.—§ 10. The rise of Arianism.—§ 11. Its progress.—§ 12. The Nicene council.—§ 13. History of Arianism after that council.—§ 14. under the sons of Constantine.—§ 15. under *Julian*, *Jovian*, &c.—§ 16. Sects among the Arians.—§ 17. Heresy of Apollinaris.—§ 18. Marcellus of Ancyra.—§ 19. Heresy of Photinus.—§ 20. That of Macedonius. The council of Constantinople.—§ 21, 22. The Priscillianists.—§ 23. The minor sects. Audæus.—§ 24, 25. Messalians, or Euchites.

§ 1. THE seeds and remains of those sects which were conspicuous in the preceding centuries, continued in this, especially in the East; nor did they cease to make some proselytes, notwithstanding the absurdity of their opinions. The *Manichean* faction beyond others, and by its very turpitude, ensnared many; and often, persons of good talents also, as appears by the example of *Augustine*. This wide spreading pestilence, the most respectable doctors of the age, and among them *Augustine*, when recovered from his infatuation, made efforts to arrest; some, indeed, with more learning and discrimination, and others with less, but none of them without some success. But the disease could not be wholly extirpated, either by books or by severe laws¹, but after remaining latent for a time, and when most people supposed it extinct, it would break out again with greater violence. For the Manicheans, to avoid the

¹ See in the *Codex Theodosianus*, tom. vi. pt. i. ed. Ritter, various and peculiarly severe laws of the emperors against the Manicheans. In the year 372, *Valentinian* senior forbade their holding meetings, and laid their preachers under heavy penalties, p. 126. In the year 381, *Theodosius* the Great

pronounced them infamous, and deprived them of all the rights of citizens, p. 133. See other laws even more severe than these, p. 137, 138, 170, &c. [The writers who confuted the Manicheans are very fully enumerated by *Dr. Walch*, in his *Historie der Ketzererey*, vol. i. p. 808, &c. *Schltz*]

severity of the laws, assumed successively various names, as *Encratites*, *Apotactics*, *Saccophori*, *Hydroparastatæ*, *Solitaries*, and others: under these names they often lay concealed for a time; but not long, for the vigilance of their enemies would find them out².

§ 2. But the state had little to fear from these people, whose energies were gradually impaired and oppressed, in the Roman empire, by penal laws and persecutions. A much more threatening storm arose in Africa, which, though small in its commencement, kept both the church and the state in commotion for more than a century. *Mensurius*, the bishop of Carthage in Africa, dying in the year 311, the majority of the people and of the clergy elected *Cecilian*, the archdeacon, in his place; and he was consecrated immediately, without waiting for the bishops of Numidia, by the bishops of Africa³. The Numidian bishops, who, according to custom, should have been present at the consecration, took it very ill that they were excluded from this ceremony: and therefore, having assembled at Carthage, they summoned *Cæcilian* to appear before them. The feelings of these excited bishops were still more inflamed, by the efforts of certain presbyters of Carthage, especially *Botrus* and *Celesius*, the competitors of *Cæcilian*; and by an opulent lady named *Lucilla*, who was unfriendly to *Cæcilian*, (by whom she had been reproved for her superstition,) and who distributed large sums of money among those Numidians, that they might vigorously oppose the new bishop. Therefore, when *Cæcilian* refused to appear before the tribunal of these bishops, seventy in number, and headed by *Secundus*, bishop of Tigisis, they proceeded, with the approbation of a considerable part of the clergy and people of Carthage, to pronounce *Cæcilian* unworthy of his office; and then created *Majorinus*, his deacon, bishop of Carthage. Hence the Carthaginian church was divided into two factions, headed by the two bishops *Cæcilian* and *Majorinus*.

§ 3. The Numidians stated two grounds of their sentence

² See the law of Theodosius, in the *Code Theodos.* tom. vi. p. 134. 136—138. [The popular name assumed by the Manichæans were *ἐγκραῖται*, *Continents*, from their condemning marriage; *ἀποτακτικοί*, *set apart*, or consecrated to God; *σακκοφοροί*, *wearers of*

sackcloth; *ὑδροπαραστάται*, *presulators of water*, from their using water only in the eucharist; and *Σολitarii*, *Solitaries*, or monks. *Tr.*]

³ Proper, or the province of which Carthage was the capital. *Tr.*

against *Cecilian*. I. That the principal bishop concerned in his consecration, *Felix* of Aptungis, was a *traditor*; that is, that during the persecution of Diocletian, he had delivered up the sacred books to the magistrates to be burned; and, therefore, that he was an apostate from *Christ*, and of course could not impart the Holy Ghost to the new made bishop. II. That *Cecilian* himself, when a deacon, had been hard-hearted and cruel to the witnesses for *Christ*, or the *martyrs*, during the Diocletian persecution; and had forbidden food to be carried to them in prison. To these two causes they added the contumacy of *Cecilian*, who being summoned to a trial before them, refused to appear. Among these Numidian bishops, no one was more ardent and violent than *Donatus*, the bishop of *Casæ Nigræ*; whence, as most writers suppose, the whole party opposed to *Cecilian* were from him called *Donatists*: though there are those who think the name was derived from the other *Donatus*, whom the Donatists called *the Great*¹. In a very short time this controversy was diffused over the whole, not only of Numidia, but even of Africa; and most of the cities had two bishops, one taking sides with *Cecilian*, and the other with *Majorinus*.

§ 4. The Donatists having brought this controversy before *Constantine* the Great, in the year 313, the emperor committed the examination of it to *Melchiades*, the Roman bishop, with whom, as assessors, he joined three bishops from Gaul. In this court, *Cecilian* was acquitted of the charges alleged against him; but the allegations against *Felix* of Aptungis, who had consecrated him, were not examined. The emperor, therefore, in the year 314, committed the cause of *Felix* to the

¹ In the Donatist contests, two persons of the name of Donatus distinguished themselves; the one was a Numidian, and bishop of *Casæ Nigræ*; the other was the second leader of the Donatists, succeeded Majorinus as bishop of Carthage, and on account of his learning and virtues, was honoured by his partizans with the title of *Great*. The learned have raised the question, From which of these men did the Donatists derive their name? Arguments of about equal strength may be adduced on both sides of this unimportant question. I should think the name was derived from both. [The Donatists received seve-

ral names. In the commencement of the schism, they were called (*pars Majorini*) the *Party of Majorinus*. Afterwards, they were called *Donatians* and *Donatists*; though they would not allow of this name, which was given them by the orthodox. Finally, they were called (*Montenses*) *Mountaineers*, (a name which they bore only at Rome; and either, because they held their meetings in a *mountain*, or because they resembled the *Mountainists*;) also *Campite*, and *Rapite* [or *Rapitani*];—because they assembled on the *plains*, and among the clefts of the *rocks*. *Schl.*]

separate examination of *Ælian*, his proconsul for Africa, by whom *Felix* was pronounced innocent. But the Donatists raised many exceptions against the decisions of *Melchiades* and *Ælian*; and, especially, they objected to the small number of bishops who were joined with *Melchiades* as judges. They said, a formal decision of seventy venerable bishops of Numidia, ought undoubtedly to have more weight than a decree of only nineteen bishops—the number present at Rome⁵—and those but little acquainted with the transactions in Africa. To quiet these murmurs, the emperor, in the year 314, appointed a much larger tribunal to meet at Arles, composed of bishops from the provinces of Italy, Gaul, Germany, and Spain. Here again the Donatists lost their cause, and appealed to a trial before the emperor himself. He did not reject the appeal, but in the year 316, examined the cause at Milan, the parties being present before him. His decision also was against the Donatists⁶; and this contumacious party now cast reproaches on the emperor himself; and complained that *Hosius*, the bishop of Corduba, who was the friend both of the emperor and *Cæcilian*, had corrupted the mind of the former to give an unrighteous decision. This moved the emperor's indignation, and he now (in the year 316) ordered their temples to be taken from them in Africa, and the seditious bishops to be

⁵ ["The Emperor, in his letters to Melchiades, named no more than three prelates, viz. Maternus, Rheticius, and Marinus, bishops of Cologne, Autun, and Arles, to sit with him as judges of this controversy; but afterwards he ordered seven more to be added to the number, and as many as could soon and conveniently assemble; so that they were at last nineteen in all." *MacL.*]

⁶ No proofs could be more clear than those afforded by this whole controversy, of the supremacy of the emperor's power in matters of religion. It is obvious, that no person in that age conceived of a single supreme judge over the whole church appointed by Christ himself. The conventions at Rome and Arles are commonly called *councils*; but whoever views them impartially will perceive that they were not properly *councils*; but rather *courts* held by special judges appointed by the emperor; or, to speak in the language of modern times, *High Commission Courts*. [To this

opinion Dr. Walsh subscribes, in his *Histoire der Ketzeren*, vol. iv. p. 343, &c. where he says: "The whole history speaks out loudly, that in settling this controversy and restoring peace, the bishop of Rome did nothing, and the emperor every thing. In the numerous transactions, the bishop Melchiades appears only once, and then not as supreme head of the church, but merely as the emperor's *commissioner*, charged with the execution of his commands. No papal ordinance, no appeal to the court of Rome, no dernier decision, was here once thought of. So the ecclesiastical law of Africa, in that age, had no article respecting the authority of the pope. On the contrary, from the commencement till the final subjugation of the Donatists, we every where meet with the emperor, imperial trials, imperial commissioners, imperial laws, imperial punishments, imperial executive officers, all in full operation. *Schl.*"]

banished; and some of them also—perhaps for the licentiousness of their tongues and pens—he caused to be put to death. Hence arose violent commotions and tumults in Africa; for the Donatist party was very numerous and powerful: and the emperor in vain strove to allay these tumults by his envoys.

§ 5. It was unquestionably amidst these commotions, that those called *Circumcelliones*⁷ first originated; a furious, headlong, sanguinary set, composed of the peasantry and rustic populace, who, espousing the cause of the Donatists, defended it by the force of arms, and roaming through the province of Africa, filled it with slaughter, rapine, and burnings, and committed the most atrocious crimes against the adverse party. This mad throng, which disregarded death and every evil, nay, faced death, when there was occasion, with the greatest boldness, brought extreme odium upon the Donatists: and yet it does not appear, from any competent evidence, that the Donatist bishops, and especially those possessed of any measure of good sense and religion, approved or instigated their proceedings. The storm continuing to increase, and seeming to threaten a civil war, *Constantine*, after attempting a reconciliation without effect, at the suggestion of the prefects of Africa, repealed the laws against the Donatists⁸, and gave the African people full liberty to follow either of the contending parties, as they liked best⁹.

§ 6. After the death of *Constantine* the Great, his son *Constans*, to whom Africa had fallen, in the year 348, sent into that country *Macarius* and *Paulus*, as his lieutenants, to heal this deplorable schism, and to persuade the Donatists to reconciliation with the orthodox. But the chief Donatist bishop, *Donatus*, whom this sect denominated the Great, strenuously opposed a reconciliation; and the other bishops followed his example. The *Circumcelliones* also contended furiously, with

⁷ [They were called *Circumcelliones* (*ragrants*), or by contraction, *Circelliones*; from the (*cellæ*) cottages of the peasants, around which they hovered, having no fixed residence. They styled themselves *Agonistici* (*combatants*), pretending that they were combating and vanquishing the devil. Dr. Walch, *loc. cit.* p. 157, thinks it cannot be proved that the *Cir-*

cumcelliones appeared on the stage before the time of *Constans*. *Schl.*]

⁸ [A. D. 321. *Tr.*]

⁹ [The Donatists now became very numerous throughout Africa. In some places they were more numerous than the Catholics. In the year 330, one of their councils consisted of no less than 270 bishops. See *Augustine*, Ep. 93. *Tr.*]

slaughter and arms, for the party which they had espoused. After *Macarius* had vanquished these in battle at Bagnia¹, he no longer recommended, but commanded peace and reconciliation. A few *Donatists* obeyed; the majority either fled, or were sent into banishment, among whom was *Donatus* the Great; and many suffered the severest punishments. In this persecution of the *Donatists*, which lasted thirteen years, many things were done, as the *Catholics* themselves concede², which no upright, impartial, and humane person can well say were righteous and just. And hence the numerous complaints made by the *Donatists*, of the cruelty of their adversaries³.

§ 7. *Julian*, on his accession to the government of the empire, in the year 362, permitted the *Donatists* to return to their country, and enjoy their former liberty. After their return they drew, in a short time, the greater part of Africa into their communion⁴. *Gratian* enacted indeed some laws against them; and especially in 387, commanded all their temples to be taken from them, and all their assemblies, even in the fields and private houses, to be broken up⁵. But the fury of the *Circumcelliones*, who were the soldiery of the *Donatists*, and the fear of producing intestine war, prevented, no doubt, the vigorous execution of these laws; for it appears that in the conclusion of this century the *Donatist* community in Africa was so extensive as to have more than four hundred bishops.

¹ [Or Bagaja. *Tr.*]

² I will here give a quotation from Optatus of Milevi, whom none will refuse as a witness; *de Schismate Donatistar.* lib. iii. § 1, p. 51, ed. Du Pin: "Ab Operariis unitatis" (the imperial legates *Macarius* and *Paullus*) "multa quidam asperè gesta sunt.—Egerunt omnes Episcopi cum clericis suis, aliqui sunt mortui: qui fortiores fuerunt, capti et longe relegati sunt." Through this whole book, Optatus is at much pains to apologize for this severity, the blame of which he casts upon the *Donatists*. Yet he does not dissemble, that all of it cannot by any means be approved or justified.

³ See the *Collatio Carthagin. dici tertie*, § 253, at the end of Optatus, p. 315.

⁴ [When the *Donatists* returned, under the permission of *Julian*, they demanded of the orthodox the restoration of their churches. And as they were not willing to give them up, and as little

could be expected from the civil authorities, the *Donatists* felt justified in depending upon their own strength. Most unhappy proceedings ensued, which have brought lasting disgrace upon the *Donatists*. Bloodshed, merciless denial of the necessities of life, violation of females, in a word, the worst excesses of an oppressed party which, after long continued sufferings felt itself authorized to take unsparing revenge, attended the restoration of the *Donatists*; and by craft and violence must their churches be built up. The orthodox made resistance, and would not tamely suffer abuse. And hence arose those tumultuous scenes which the magistrates reported to the court; and very probably, had *Julian* lived a little longer, persecuting laws would have been issued by the government. See Dr. Walsh, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. iv. p. 175. *Schl.*]

⁵ [*Index Theodos.* l. ii. ne sanct. Bapt. iteretur. *Schl.*]

As the century drew to a close, however, two things impaired not a little the energies of this very flourishing community. The one was a great schism that arose in it, occasioned by one *Maximinus*⁶; than which nothing could more aid the Catholics in opposing the Donatists. The other was the zeal against them of *Augustine*, first a presbyter, and then bishop of Hippo. For he assailed them most vigorously, by his writings, discourses, conferences, advice, admonitions, and by conventions; and being keen and energetic above measure, he roused against them, not only Africa, but all Christendom besides, including the court itself⁷.

§ 8. The Donatists were sound in doctrine, as their adversaries admit; nor were their lives censurable, if we except the enormities of the *Circumcelliones*, which were detested by the greatest part of the Donatists. Their fault was, that they considered the African church to have fallen from the rank and privileges of a true church, and to be without the gifts of the Holy Spirit, from its adherence to *Cæcilian*, on account of that man's offences, and those of his consecrator, *Felix* of Aptungis. All other churches likewise, which associated and connected with this in Africa, they looked upon as defiled and polluted. For their own body, on account of the sanctity of its bishops, they claimed exclusively the name of a true, pure, and holy church; nor, in consequence of these opinions, would they hold any communion with other churches, for fear of contracting some defilement. This error led them to maintain that the sacred rites and administrations of Christians who disagreed with them were destitute of all efficacy; and not only to rebaptize those who came over to them from other societies, but also to exclude from the sacred office, or re-ordain, those ministers of religion who joined their community. This pestilence scarcely extended beyond Africa; for the few small

⁶ [On this schism among the Donatists, and others of less magnitude, see Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. iv. p. 258—267. *Schl.*]

⁷ [A full catalogue of the writings of Augustine against the Donatists, is given by Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. iv. p. 254, &c. and of his other efforts against them, an account is given, *ibid.* p. 181, &c. We will make here a single remark; that it was during these contests, Augustine first exhibited in his writings that horrid principle; *Hæretics*

are to be punished with temporal punishments and death;—a principle wholly inconsistent with Christianity, and one which, in after ages, served as an excuse for inhuman cruelties. Only read Augustine's 43th Epistle, *ad Vincent*, and his 50th, *ad Bonifac*, and several others; and you will there meet with all the plausible arguments, which the spirit of persecution in after ages so dressed up—to the disgrace of Christianity—as to blind the eyes of kings. *Schl.*]

congregations which the Donatists formed in Spain and Italy, had no permanencè, but were soon broken up⁸.

§ 9. Not long after the commencement of the Donatist controversy, or in the year 317, another storm arose in Egypt, more pernicious and of greater consequence, which spread its ravages over the whole Christian world. The ground of this contest was the doctrine of *three persons in the Godhead*; a doctrine which, during the three preceding centuries, had not been in all respects defined. It had, indeed, often been decided, in opposition to the Sabellians and others, that there is a *réal* difference between the Father and the Son, and also between them and the Holy Spirit; or, as we commonly express it, that there are three distinct persons in the Godhead. But the mutual relations of these persons, and the nature of the difference between them, had not been a subject of dispute, and therefore nothing had been decreed by the church on these points. Much less was there any prescribed phraseology which it was necessary to use when speaking on this mystery. The doctors, therefore, explained this subject in different ways, and gave various representations of the difference between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, without offence being taken. In Egypt and the neighbouring countries, the greater part had, in this article as well as others, followed the opinions of *Origen*, who had taught that the *Son is in God*, what *reason is in man*, and that the Holy Spirit is nothing else than the *divine energy* or *power of acting* and working; which opinion, if it be not cautiously stated, may lead, among other difficulties, to the subversion of any real distinction between the divine persons, or in other words to Sabellianism.

§ 10. *Alexander*, the bishop of Alexandria,—it is uncertain

⁸ A more full account of the Donatists, is given by Hen. Valesius, *Diss. de Schismate Donatistarum*, which is subjoined to his edition of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*:—by Thos. Ittig, *Historia Donatismi*; in an appendix to his book, *de Hæresibus Eccl. Apostolicæ*, p. 241.—by Herm. Witsius, *Miscellaneor. Sacror.* tom. i. lib. iv. p. 742.—by Hen. Noris, *Historia Donatiana*; a posthumous work, which the brothers Bellerini enlarged and published, Opp. tom. iv. p. xlv. &c.—and by Thos. Long, *History of the Donatists*, London, 1677, 8vo. The

narrative we have given above, is derived from the original sources; and, if our life is spared, it will in due time be corroborated by a statement of the requisite testimonies. [What chancellor Mosheim was prevented from fulfilling, by his death, his successor in the professorial chair of church history, Dr. *Wach*, has now accomplished, to the satisfaction of all the friends of this branch of knowledge, in the fourth volume of his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, p. 1—351. *Schl.*]

on what occasion,—expressed himself rather freely on this subject in a meeting of his presbyters; and maintained, among other things, that the Son possesses not only the same dignity as the Father, but also the same *essence*⁹. But *Arius*, one of the presbyters, a man of an acute mind, and fluent, influenced perhaps by ill-will towards his bishop¹, at first denied the truth of *Alexander's* positions, on the ground that they were allied to the Sabellian errors, which had been condemned by the church: and then, going to the opposite extreme, he maintained, that the Son is totally and *essentially* distinct from the Father; that he was, in fact, only the first and noblest of those created beings whom God the Father formed out of nothing, and the instrument which the Father used in creating this material universe; and, therefore, that he was inferior to the Father both in *nature* and in *dignity*². What were his views of the Holy Spirit is

⁹ See Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 5. Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 2.

¹ [A historian should be cautious of judging of the motives of human actions; for there are cases, in which a man's motives are discernible only to the eye of Omniscience. The present is such a case. Here we can express only a dubious "*perhaps*," when we impartially survey the sources of the history of Arius. We commonly read, it is true, that ambition of distinction led Arius to contradict his bishop. But this cannot be proved by credible testimony: and his opposers, Alexander and Athanasius, who would surely have used this fact to his disadvantage, if it had been known to them, observe a profound silence on the subject. On the contrary, Philostorgius relates (*Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 3.) that Arius, when the votes of the electors were very favourable to himself, modestly directed the choice on Alexander. Philostorgius, it must be owned, was an Arian in sentiment, and his testimony is of no great weight. But the direct contrary to what he states is not capable of proof. The motives, therefore, which actuated Arius, in opposing his bishop, must be regarded as dubious. Probably something of human infirmity was found on both sides. The conduct of Arius in the contest itself betrays pride, conceit of learning, and a contentious disposition. On the other hand, the Arians complain that Alexander was actuated by envy and personal hatred of Arius, because

the great popularity of Arius had excited his jealousy. See Dr. Walsh, *Historie der Kitzereyen*, vol. ii. p. 395, &c. Schl.]

² [Both Alexander and Arius have left us statements, each of his own doctrinal views, and also what he understood to be the sentiments of his antagonist. The statements are in their private letters, written after long and public discussions at Alexandria, and when Arius and his friends were cast out of the church. The letter of Alexander is addressed to his namesake, Alexander of Byzantium, since of Constantinople: and that of Arius to his friend Eusebius of Nicomedia. Both are preserved by Theodoret, *Hist. Ecc.* l. i. c. 4, 5. It may gratify the reader, who has not access to the original, to peruse the following extracts, containing the grand points, as originally contested in the great Arian controversy, and in the language of the first combatants.—Alexander states that Arius and his adherents, "Denying the divinity of our Saviour, pronounced him *τοῖς πασιν ἰσὺν ἀναί*, on a level with all other creatures." He says that they held, "there was a time, when the Son of God was not; and he who once had not existence, afterwards did exist; and from that time was, what every man naturally is; for (say they) God made all things of nothing, including the Son of God in this creation of all things both rational and irrational: and of course, pronouncing him

not equally manifest. That his views of the Son of God were combined with some other opinions differing from the common

to be of a changeable nature, and capable of virtue and of sin—The doctrine just risen up in opposition to the piety of the church, is that of Ebion and Artemas, and is an imitation of that of Paul of Samosata.” Alexander then gives his own views, as follows: “We believe, as the Apostolic church does, in the only unbegotten Father, who derived his existence from no one, and is immutable and unalterable, always the same and uniform, unsusceptible of increase or diminution; the giver of the law and the prophets and the gospels; Lord of the patriarchs and apostles and of all saints: and in one Lord, Jesus Christ; the only begotten Son of God; not begotten from nothing, but from the living Father; and not after the manner of material bodies, by separations and effluxes of parts, as Sabellius and Valentinian supposed; but in an inexplicable and indescribable manner, agreeably to the declaration before quoted. ‘Who shall declare his generation?’ For his existence (*ὑπόστασις*) is inscrutable to all mortal beings; just as the Father is inscrutable; because created intelligences are incapable of understanding this divine generation from the Father.—No one knoweth what the Father is, but the Son; and no one knoweth what the Son is, but the Father.—He is unchangeable, as much as the Father; lacks nothing; is the perfect Son, and the absolute likeness of the Father, save only that he is not unbegotten.—Therefore to the unbegotten Father, his proper dignity (*οἰκεῖον ἀξίωμα*) must be preserved. And to the Son also suitable honour must be given, by ascribing to him an eternal generation (*ἀπαρχὴν γέννησιν*) from the Father.” Such is the statement of Alexander.—The letter of Arius is as follows: “To his very dear lord that man of God, the faithful, orthodox Eusebius; Arius, who is unjustly persecuted by the bp. Alexander, on account of that all-conquering truth which thou also defendest, greeting in the Lord. As my father Ammonius is going to Nicomedia, it seemed proper for me to address you by him, and to acquaint the native love and affection which you exercise towards the brethren for God and his Christ’s sake, that the bishop greatly oppresses and persecutes us, putting

everything in motion against us; and so as to drive us out of the city, as if we were atheists; because we do not agree with him, publicly asserting, that God always was, and the Son always was; that he was always the Father, always the Son; that the Son was of God himself; and that because your brother Eusebius of Caesarea, and Theodotius, and Paulinus, and Athanasius, and Gregory, and Aëtius, and all they of the East, say that God was before the Son, and without beginning, they are accused; except only Philogonius and Hellenicus and Macarius, unlearned and heretical men, who say of the Son, one of them, that he is an emanation, another, that he is an emission, and another, that he is equally unbegotten; which impieties we could not even hear, though the heretics should threaten us with a thousand deaths. As to what we say and believe, we have taught, and still teach, that the Son is not unbegotten, nor a portion of the unbegotten, in any manner: nor was he formed out of any subjacent matter, but that, in will and purpose, he existed before all times and before all worlds, perfect God (*πλήρης ὄντος*), the only-begotten, unchangeable; and that before he was begotten, or created, or purposed, or established, he was not; for he was never unbegotten. We are persecuted, because we say, the Son had a beginning, but God was without beginning. We are also persecuted, because we say, that he is from nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἔστιν*); and this we say, inasmuch as he is not a portion of God, nor formed from any subjacent matter. Therefore we are persecuted. The rest you know. I bid you adieu in the Lord.”—According to these statements, both the Arians and the orthodox considered the Son of God and Saviour of the world, as a derived existence, and as *generated* by the Father. But they differed on two points. I. The Orthodox believed his generation was *from eternity*, so that he was coeval with the Father. But the Arians believed, there was a time when the Son was not. II. The Orthodox believed the Son to be derived of and from the Father; so that he was *ὁμοούσιος*, of the same essence with the Father. But the Arians believed, that

sentiments of Christians cannot be doubted³. But no one of the ancients has left us a connected and systematic account of the religion professed by *Arius* and his associates⁴.

§ 11. The opinions of *Arius* were no sooner divulged, than they found very many abettors, and among them men of distinguished talents and rank, both in Egypt and the neighbouring provinces. *Alexander*, on the other hand, accused *Arius* of blasphemy before two councils assembled at Alexandria, and cast him out of the church⁵. He was not at all discouraged by this disgrace, but retiring to Palestine, he wrote various letters

he was formed out of nothing, ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων εἶναι, by the creative power of God. Both, however, agreed in calling him God, and in ascribing to him divine perfections. As to his offices, or his being the Saviour of sinful men, it does not appear, that they differed materially in their views. (See p. 384, Note⁷.) Indeed so imperfect and fluctuating were the views of that age respecting the offices of Christ and the way in which sinners are saved, that he was, for aught they could see, an equally competent Saviour, whether he were a finite creature, or the infinite and all-perfect God. Hence both the Arians and the orthodox then embraced the same system of theology in substance; and the chief importance, in a theological view, of their controversy respecting the Sonship of Christ, related to the assigning him that rank in the universe which properly belonged to him. *Tr.*—*Arius* first published his heresy about the year 319. Newman's *Arians in the fourth century*, 255. *Ed.*]

³ [This conjecture of Dr. Mosheim (which his former translator has swelled into a strong affirmation,) appears to be gratuitous. See the preceding Note. *Tr.*]

⁴ The history of the Arian contests is to be drawn from Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini Magni*; from various tracts of Athanasius, *Opp.* tom. i.; from the *Eccles. Histories* of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret; from Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxi.; and from other writers of this and the following century. But among all these, there is not one whom we may justly pronounce free from partiality. And the Arian history still needs a writer of integrity, and void alike of hatred and love. There were faults on both sides; but those who hitherto

have described this controversy, could discover the faults of only one of the parties. [This has now ceased to be absolutely true; since Dr. Walsh, in the second vol. of his *Geschichte der Ketzerreigen*, p. 385—700, has so treated the history of Arius and his followers, that a man must himself be in the highest degree partial; if he can deny the honour of impartiality to Dr. Walsh. *Schll.*] It is a common opinion, that Arius was too much attached to the sentiments of Plato and Origen. See Dion. Petavius, *Doct. Theol.* tom. ii. l. i. c. 8. p. 36. But those who think so are certainly in an error. For Origen and Plato differ widely from Arius; on the contrary it cannot well be doubted, that Alexander, the opposer of Arius, in his explanation of the doctrine of three Persons in one God closely followed the footsteps of Origen. See Ralph Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, vol. i. p. 676; &c.

⁵ [Alexander first employed milder measures; for he sent a letter, which was subscribed by the clergy of Alexandria, to Arius and the other clergymen united with him, warning them to abandon their error. (Athanasius, *Opp.* tom. i. pt. i. p. 396.) When this measure failed, he brought the subject before the bishops of his party. He first held a council at Alexandria (A. D. 321), composed of Egyptian and Libyan bishops; and then another assembly, composed only of the presbyters and deacons of the city of Alexandria and the province of Marcotis. The first was properly a council; the other was not. And hence it is, that some historians speak of but *one* council of Alexandria. See Dr. Walsh's *Historie der Kirchenverwandlungen*, p. 140; and his *Historie der Ketzerreigen*, vol. ii. p. 424, &c. *Schll.*]

to men of distinction, in which he laboured to demonstrate the truth of his doctrines, and with so much success that he drew over immense numbers to his side, and in particular *Eusebius*, bishop of Nicomedia, who was a man of vast influence⁶. The emperor *Constantine*, who considered the discussion as relating to a matter of little importance, and remote from the fundamentals of religion, at first addressed the disputants by letter, admonishing them to desist from contention⁷. But when he

⁶ [These bishops held a council in Bithynia, probably at Nicomedia, in which 250 bishops are reported to have been present. Of their acts and decisions, we know nothing more than that they sent letters to all the bishops of Christendom, intreating them not to exclude the friends of Arius from their communion, and requesting them to intercede with Alexander that he would not do so. This first Arian council is either wholly overlooked by modern writers, or is confounded with that of Antioch in the year 330. Sozomen gives account of it; *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 15. See Nicetas, in *Biblioth. Max. Patr.* tom. xxv. p. 151; and Ceiller's *Histoire des Auteurs*, tom. iii. p. 566. Waleh, *Historie der Kircheneversammlungen*, p. 142. *Tr.*]

⁷ [Constantine not only wrote a letter in the year 324, but he sent with it, as his envoy, the famous Hosius, bishop of Corduba. What part the envoy acted is unknown, but the letter is extant, fully, in *Eusebius, de Vita Constantini* M. lib. ii. c. 64–72, and with some curtailment, in Soerates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 7. The most important part of this singular document, which, however, shows the feelings of one more solicitous for the great cause of our common Christianity, than for absolute perfection in speculative theology, is as follows:—

“I learn, then, that the origin of the present controversy was thus.—Whereas you, Alexander, inquired of the presbyters, what each believed on one of the subjects contained in the law, or rather on a point of a vain controversy; and whereas you, Arius, inconsiderately advanced what ought not to have entered your mind,—or, if it did, should have been smothered in silence; hereupon dissension arose between you, communion has been denied; and the most holy people, being split into two parties, the harmony of the whole body is destroyed.

Wherefore do ye, mutually forgiving one another, follow the counsel here fitly offered you by your fellow worshipper [of the true God]. And what is it? It is, that it was unsuitable, at first, to put a question on such subjects; and when it was put, it was unsuitable to answer it. For such questions, being required by no law, but prompted by the contentiousness of unprofitable leisure,—though they may be proposed for the exercise of our natural powers,—ought to be kept to ourselves, and not rashly to be brought before public meetings, nor be inconsiderately trusted to the ears of the people. For, how few are there that can accurately comprehend and suitably explain the nature of so great and so exceedingly difficult subjects? Yet if any one thinks he could easily do this, how large a part of the people will he persuade to think so? or who can urge the critical examination of such questions, without hazarding a fall? Wherefore, praying on such subjects is to be restrained; lest, either from the imbecility of our natures, we should be unable to explain the subject proposed, or from the dulness of apprehension in our hearers, they should not be able to comprehend exactly what is spoken; and lest, from one or the other of these causes, the people should incur the danger either of blasphemy or schism. Therefore, let an unwise question in the one, and an inconsiderate answer in the other of you, mutually pardon each other. For the controversy between you is not about the chief of the precepts of our law (the holy Scripture); nor have you introduced any new heresy relating to practical religion; but you both have one and the same views, so that you may easily come together in the bonds of fellowship. While you thus contend about little and exceedingly unimportant points (*ὅτι μικρῶν καὶ διὰ διαφορῶν*), it is not suitable for so numerous a body of God's people to be under

found that nothing was effected by this measure, and that greater commotion was daily rising throughout the empire, he, in the year 325, summoned that famous council of the whole church which met at *Nice*, in Bithynia, to put an end to this controversy. In this council, after various altercations and conflicts of the bishops, the doctrine of *Arius* was condemned, *Christ* was pronounced to be (*ὁμοούσιος*) of the same essence with the Father, *Arius* was sent into exile in Illyricum, and his fol-

your guidance, on account of your dissension : indeed, it is not only unsuitable, but it is believed to be absolutely unlawful. That I may admonish your sagacity, by a smaller instance, I will say ; all those philosophers who profess one system of doctrine, you know very often differ on some part of their positions. But though they disagree in the perfection of their knowledge, yet on account of their union as to the system of their doctrine, they come together again harmoniously. Now if *they* do so, how much more reasonable is it for *you*, the appointed ministers of the great God, to be of one heart in the profession of the same religion ? Let us look more attentively and closely into what is now advanced. *Is it right*, on account of the little vain disputes about words among you, for brethren to array themselves against brethren, and the precious assembly to be rent asunder by the ungodly strife of you who thus contend about trifles of no consequence ? (*ὁπὲρ μικρῶν οὕτω καὶ μηδαμῶς ἀναγκαίων* ;) This is vulgar and despicable : it is more befitting the folly of children, than the discretion of priests and wise men. Let us spontaneously depart from the temptations of the devil. Our great God, the common preserver of us all, hath extended to all the common light ; and allow me, his servant, under his providence, to bring my efforts to a successful issue, that by my admonitions, diligence, and earnest exhortations, I may bring his people to have fellowship in their meeting together. For since, as I said, ye both have one faith (*μία τις ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ πίστεως*), and one and the same understanding of our religion (*καὶ μία τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀπίστεως σύνσις*) ; and since the requirement of the law, in its various parts, binds all to one consent and purpose of mind ; and as this thing which has produced a little strife among you, does not extend to the power and effi-

cacy of the whole gospel, (*μὴ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ παντὸς δύναμιν διήκει*), let it not at all produce separations and commotions among you. And these things I say, not to compel you to a perfect consent on this very unwise and undefinable question. For the high privileges of communion may be preserved to you unimpaired, and the same fellowship may be kept up among you all, though there may be among you partial disagreement about some trivial point. For we do not all choose alike, nor is there one and the same disposition and judgment in us all. Therefore, concerning the divine Providence, let there be one faith, one understanding, and one covenant with God. But as for those trivial questions, which ye so elaborately discuss, though you should not think exactly alike, it is fit that the fact remain within your own cogitations, and be kept as a secret in your own breast. Let the privileges of mutual friendship, and the belief of the truth, and the precious worship of God and observance of his law, remain unimpaired among you. Return again to mutual friendship and charity ; give to all the people their proper embraces ; and, having purified as it were your own minds, do ye again recognize each other : for friendship, when it returns to a reconciliation, after ill will is laid aside, often becomes more sweet than before. And restore to me also serene days, and nights void of care, so that there may be in reserve for me the enjoyment of the pure light, and the pleasures of a quiet life. If this fail, I must unavoidably sigh and be bathed in tears, and spend the residue of my days unquietly. For while the people of God, my fellow worshippers, are so rent asunder by unreasonable and hurtful contentions, how can my mind be at ease, and my thoughts at rest ?" *Tr.*]

lowers were compelled to assent to a *Creed*, or confession of faith, composed by the council⁸.

§ 12. No part of church history, perhaps, has acquired more celebrity than this assembly of bishops at Nice to settle the affairs of the church; and yet it is very singular that scarcely any part of it has been treated and illustrated more negligently⁹. The ancient writers are not agreed as to the time and year, nor the place, nor the number of the judges, nor the president of this council, nor as to many other particulars¹. No written *journal*

⁸ This *creed* is illustrated from ancient records, in a learned work on the subject, by Joh. Christ. Saicer, Utrecht, 1718, 4to. [The creed used in the Romish, Lutheran, and English churches, and called the Nicene creed, is in reality the creed set forth by the council of Constantinople in the year 381. It is considerably more full than the original Nicene creed; which is here subjoined, together with a translation. *Ἰστυόμεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτίστιν, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ; δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ· τὸν δὲ ἡμεῖς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσις ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντες εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν τρεπτὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. See Walch, *Biblioth. Synbol. Vetus*, p. 75, 76. Translation: We believe in one God, the Father, almighty, the maker of all things visible and invisible: and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only-begotten, (that is,) of the substance of the Father; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten not made; of the same substance with the Father; by whom all things were made, that are in heaven and that are in earth: who for us men, and for our salvation, descended, and*

was incarnate, and became man; suffered, and rose again the third day, ascended into the heavens; and will come to judge the living and the dead: and in the Holy Spirit. But those who say, that there was a time when he was not, and that he was not before he was begotten, and that he was made out of nothing, or affirm that he is of any other substance or essence, or that the Son of God is created, and mutable or changeable, the catholic church doth pronounce accursed. *Tr.*]

⁹ See Tho. Ittig, *Historia Concilii Niceni*, published after his death. [Lips. 1712, 4to.] Jo. Le Clerc, *Bibliothèque Historique et Universelle*, tom. x. p. 421, and tom. xxii. p. 291. Is. de Beausobre, *Histoire de Manichéisme et du Manichéisme*, tom. i. p. 520, &c. The accounts left us by the orientals of this council are contained in Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 69, &c. [To the preceding works may be added, Chr. W. Fr. Walch's *Historie der Kirchensammlungen*, p. 144—153. *Schl.*]

¹ [Yet there is not great disagreement on most of these points. There is scarcely a dissenting voice as to the *year*, which was A.D. 325; though there is a disagreement as to the *month*, when the council first met; namely, whether it was the 13th of the Kalends of June, or July; that is, the 20th of *May*, or the 19th of *June*. All agree that the council closed on the emperor's Vicennalia, in July of that year. As to the *place*, there is overwhelming proof that it was the central hall or building in the imperial palace at Nice in Bithynia; which the emperor caused to be fitted up especially for the purpose. Some moderns, however, maintain that this *hall* must have been a *church*; because they cannot believe so holy a body would assemble any where, except in a church

of the proceedings of this venerable tribunal was kept; at least none has reached us². As to how many, and what enactments

duly consecrated. As to the *number* of members of which the council was composed, Eusebius, indeed, (*de Vita Constantini*, iii. c. 8.) says, "they exceeded 250 bishops." But the MS. here is believed to be corrupted; for Socrates, (*Hist. Eccles.* i. c. 8.) expressly quoting this passage of Eusebius, says, "they exceeded 300 bishops." There is satisfactory proof that there were 318 members of the council; besides a vast number of clergymen and others, who attended from curiosity, or for their own improvement in knowledge. The ancient writers make no mention whatever of any *president* or *scribe* of the council. They represent the council as assembling, and the emperor as entering, advancing to the upper end of the hall, and upon a signal from the bishops, taking his seat, which was a golden chair; after which the whole council was seated; several of the principal bishops on the right and left of the emperor, and the main body of them arranged on the two sides of the hall. Before this formal opening of the council, there were several rencounters of the bishops of different parties, and also of members of the council, with the philosophers and others who were assembled in the city. Of these private meetings, pompous accounts are left us by Gelasius and others. When the council assembled in form, they did no business, but remained silent, till the emperor came in. He was then addressed either by Eustathius of Antioch, or Eusebius of Cesarea, or by both, in short complimentary speeches; after which, he himself harangued the council; and having thrown into the fire, unread, all the private petitions and complaints which had been previously handed him, he bade them proceed to business. A free discussion now ensued; but, it would seem, without the formalities observed in modern deliberative assemblies. Individuals of different sentiments offered their opinions; and the emperor heard, remarked, commended, or disapproved, and so influenced the whole proceedings, as to bring about a good degree of unanimity. Yet he did not act the dictator or judge; but left the bishops to decide all the questions respecting faith and discipline, uncontrolled; for he regarded them as

the divinely constituted judges of such matters. He only wished them to come to *some* agreement; which as soon as they had done, he regarded their decision as final, and as obligatory on himself as well as all others. How many sessions were held, we are not told. But after all the business was finished, on the 24th of July, when the emperor entered on the twentieth year of his reign, he celebrated his Vicennalia with the council, in a splendid banquet in his own palace. On that occasion, Eusebius of Cesarea delivered an oration in praise of Constantine, which is lost. After the feast, the bishops were dismissed, with presents and exhortations to peace and love. They returned, as they came, by the public conveyances, having been supported by the emperor from the time they left their homes. See Eusebius, *de Vita Constantini*, l. iii. c. 6—22. Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* i. 8—11. Sozomen, *H. E.* i. 17—25. Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 7. 9, 10, 12. Rufinus, *H. E.* lib. i. Gelasius Cyzicenus, *Compend. de Synodo Nicæno*, lib. iii. in Harduin's *Conciliorum*, tom. i. p. 345, &c. *Acta Concilii Nicæni*, in Combetis' *Auctorium Biblioth. Patr.* tom. ii. p. 573. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum*, p. 69, &c.; various treatises in the first volume of the works of Athanasius, especially his *Epistola de Nicænis Decretis*; and several detached passages in Epiphanius, *contra Hæreses*, lib. iii. These are the only authentic sources for the history of this council. *Tr.*

² See Henry Valesius, Note on Euseb. *de Vita Constantini* M. lib. iii. c. 14. Marathas, a Syrian, wrote a history of this council; but it is lost. See Jos. Sim. Assemani, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatic.* tom. i. p. 195, &c. [Eusebius, in the passage just referred to, says: "What met the general approbation of the council, was committed to writing, and confirmed by the subscription of each member." Whence Valesius infers, that *nothing* was committed to writing by the council, except the *resolutions* to which they came, and which they individually subscribed; namely, the *creed*, the *canons*, and the *synodic epistle*, which was addressed to the church of Alexandria and the brethren in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis. He therefore supposes that the council kept no

were passed in it, Christians in the east, and those elsewhere, give different accounts. The latter only reckon twenty: the orientals many more³. From the canons universally received,

Journal, or had no written *Acta Concilii*, in the technical sense of the phrase. And, indeed, we have no intimation that they kept any journal of their proceedings, or had any proper scribe of council. What are called the *Acta Concilii*, as given us by Gelasius and others, are an account of various discussions between individual members of the council and certain philosophers or sophists, together with the creed, the canons, the synodic letter, several epistles of the emperor, one of Eusebius to his church of Caesarea, and various extracts from ancient authors. *Tr.*]

³ Thom. Ittig, *Supplem. Opp. Clementis Alex.* p. 191. Jos. Sim. Assensani, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatic.* tom. i. p. 22. 195, &c. Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 71, and many others. [The twenty Nicene canons, and those only, were received by the ancient church. Some attempts, indeed, were made by the bishops of Rome, in the fifth century, to make certain canons of the council of Sardica pass for canons of the council of Nice. On that occasion, the African bishops resisted, and sent to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, for complete copies of all the Nicene canons which they knew of. The returns showed, that these twenty canons, and these only, were then recognized in the Greek church. See the Acts of the sixth council of Carthage, A. D. 419. Theodoret also, (*II. E. i. 8.*) and Gelasius Cyzicenus, (*lib. ii. c. 31.*) expressly affirms, that the number of the Nicene canons was twenty. But in the sixteenth century, an Arabic copy of eighty canons, including these twenty, was brought from Alexandria to Rome, and soon afterwards translated and published. At first, there was some doubt; but in a short time all the learned were fully satisfied that the additional sixty canons were not of Nicene origin, though now regarded as such by most of the eastern sects. See Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccles. cent. iv. dissert. xviii.* vol. vii. p. 501—511. ed. Paris, 1742, 4to.—These twenty canons (or twenty-two, as some divide them,) are extant in Beveridge's *Pandect. Canon.* tom. i. p. 58, &c. and in all the larger

collections of councils. The substance of them is as follows: The first canon forbids the admission of voluntary, or self-made, eunuchs to the sacred ministry. The second forbids the hasty ordination of new converts to Christianity, agreeably to 1 Tim. iii. 6, "Not a novice," &c. The third forbids clergymen, of all ranks, from having subdued females or housekeepers; except only their nearest blood relations. The fourth directs that ordinations be generally performed by all the bishops of a province; and never by less than three bishops: and requires the confirmation of the metropolitan in all cases. The fifth requires, that an excommunication either of a clergyman or a layman, by the sentence of a single bishop, shall be valid every where till it is examined and judged of by a provincial council; and requires such a council to be held for this and other objects of general interest twice a year, once in the autumn, and once a little before Easter. The sixth secures to the patriarch of Alexandria all the rights which he claimed by ancient usage, over the bishops and churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; also to the patriarchs of Rome and Antioch, their prerogatives; and gives to metropolitans generally a negative on all elections to the episcopal office within their respective provinces. The seventh gives to the bishop of Aelia (or Jerusalem) the rank of a metropolitan; but without depriving Caesarea, the ancient metropolis, of its dignity. The eighth permits Novatian bishops and clergymen to return to the church; and retain their rank and offices, on their assenting to the rules of the church respecting second marriages, and communion with the lapsed. The ninth and tenth require, that presbyters who before their ordination had lapsed, or had committed any other offence which was a canonical disqualification for the sacred office, be deprived of their office as soon as the disqualification is ascertained. The eleventh requires the lapsed, during the late persecution under Licinius, *first*, to do penance three years without the doors of the church; *secondly*, six years in the porch among the catechumens; and *thirdly*, to be allowed to witness, but

and from other monuments, it appears, not only that *Arius* was condemned by this council, but also that other things were decreed, with a view to settle the affairs of the church. In particular, the controversy respecting the time of celebrating Easter, which had long perplexed Christians, was terminated; the Novatian disturbance, respecting the re-admission of the lapsed to communion, was composed; the Meletian schism, with its causes, was censured; the jurisdiction of the greater bishops was defined; and several other matters of a like nature determined⁴.

not join in, the celebration of the eucharist for two years more. The twelfth requires flagrant apostates to go through the same course, but they must spend ten years in the *second stage*. Yet the bishops are to exercise discretionary power in regard to the length of time. The thirteenth allows the sacrament to be given to any penitent who seems to be dying; but if he recovers, he is to rank only with the penitents in the *third stage*. By the fourteenth, lapsed *catechumens* are to spend three years in the *first stage*, or among those who worship without the doors of the church. By the fifteenth, the translation of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, from one church to another, is forbidden. By the sixteenth, presbyters or deacons, forsaking their own churches and going over to others, are to be denied communion, and be sent back: bishops also are forbidden to ordain the subjects of other bishops without their consent. The seventeenth requires the deposition of all clergymen who lend money or goods on interest. By the eighteenth, deacons are forbidden to present the bread and wine to the presbyters, or to taste them before the bishop, or to sit among the presbyters. By the nineteenth, the followers of Paul of Samosata, on returning to the church, are to be re-baptized; and to be re-ordained, before they can officiate as clergymen. The twentieth disapproves of kneeling at prayers on the Lord's day, and from Easter to Pentecost. *Tr.*]

⁴ [The synodic epistle, which is preserved by Socrates, *H. E.* i. 9, and by Theodoret, *H. E.* i. 9, acquaints us with the principal transactions of the council, and also shows the spirit of that venerable body. It is as follows: "To the great and holy, by the grace of God, the church of the Alexandrians; and to the beloved brethren of Egypt,

Libya, and Pentapolis; the bishops assembled at Nice, and composing the great and holy synod; send greeting in the Lord.

"Forasmuch as, by the grace of God, the most pious emperor Constantine having called us together from various cities and provinces, a great and holy synod is assembled at Nice; it seemed altogether necessary that an epistle be sent to you in the name of the sacred synod, that you may have means of knowing what things have been moved, and examined, and what have been sanctioned. First of all, then, an inquiry was made, in the presence of the most pious emperor Constantine, into the impiety and iniquity of Arius and his associates; and it was determined by the voice of all, that his impious doctrine is to be anathematized, as also the blasphemous words and terms he used, he having blasphemously said that the *Son of God was from nothing*, and *there was a time when he was not*; and saying, that the *Son of God, by the arbitrement of his will, is capable either of virtue or vice*; and pronouncing him *a creature and a work*: all which the holy synod hath anathematized, not enduring so much as to hear this impious doctrine, or rather madness, and these blasphemous words. What was the issue of the proceedings against him, ye have heard already, or will hear; lest we should seem to insult over a man who has received the deserved recompence of his wickedness. But his impiety prevailed so far as to involve in destruction with him Theonas of Marmarica, and Secundus of Ptolemais: for they received the same sentence. After the grace of God had delivered us from that evil doctrine, and impiety, and blasphemy, and from the persons who dared to raise discord and division among a once peaceable people, there yet remained

But while the prelates were eager to correct the faults of others, they narrowly escaped falling into a great one themselves. For they were on the point of imposing celibacy on the clergy by an express law; but the act was prevented by *Paphnutius*, who had himself lived all his days in celibacy⁵.

the rashness of Meletius and of those ordained by him. And what the synod decreed on this subject, beloved brethren, we now inform you. It was determined that Meletius (whom the synod treated with more lenity; for, according to the strictness of law, he deserved no indulgence) should remain in his own city; but should have no authority, either to ordain, to nominate for office, or be seen in any other city or place on such business; but should only possess the naked title of honour. As for those raised to office by him, after being confirmed by a more solemn consecration, fellowship is to be given them; yet on the condition, that they so hold their office and ministry, as always to take rank after all in every parish or church, who were examined and ordained previously by our dearest colleague Alexander; and moreover, have no authority to elect or to nominate such persons as they like, or indeed to do anything without the consent of some bishop of the catholic church who is Alexander's suffragan. But those who, by the grace of God and by your prayers, have never been found in any schism, but have remained blameless in the catholic church, shall have power to nominate and elect such as are worthy of the sacred office, and, in general, to do every thing that accords with law and ecclesiastical usage. And if it happen that any of those now [bishops] in the church should be removed by death, then let those lately admitted be advanced to the honours of the deceased; provided always, that they appear deserving, and the people choose them, and that the bishop of Alexandria concur in the election and confirm it. And this privilege is conceded to all others; but not so in regard to Meletius personally, to whom, on account of his former irregularity and his headlong rashness of temper, it is judged, no power or authority should be given, he being capable of again exciting the same disorders. And these are the things which relate particularly and especially to Egypt, and to the most holy church of Alexandria. But if any other canon

or decree shall be made, as our lord and most precious fellow-minister and brother is present with us, when he shall arrive he will give you a more exact account, for he will have been an actor and co-operator in the things done. We also announce to you the harmony there is in regard to the most holy paschal feast; that this matter is happily settled, through the assistance of your prayers, so that all the brethren in the East, who before kept the festival with the Jews, will hereafter keep it in harmony with the Romans, with us, and with all those who, from ancient times, have kept it with us. Therefore, rejoicing in the happy issue of affairs, and the peaceful harmony that exists, and that all heresy is extirpated, do ye receive, with greater honour and more ardent love, our fellow minister and your bishop, Alexander, who has gladdened us with his presence, encountering so great labour in his advanced age, that peace might be restored among you. And pray for us all, that whatever has been well determined upon, may remain steadfast, through our Lord Jesus Christ, being done, as we trust, according to the good pleasure of God the Father, in the Holy Spirit; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." *Tr.*—*The simple humanity of Christ*, to use a phrase in favour with Unitarians, as they call themselves, appears never to have been mentioned at Nicee: a strong presumption against modern claims of primitive antiquity for that opinion. Upon this and similar questions, see *Ante-Nicene Testimonies to the Divinity of Christ*, and also to the *Doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost*, two invaluable works of the late learned and amiable Dr. Edward Burton, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. *Ed.*

⁵ Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. i. c. 11, compare Fran. Babwin's *Constantinus Magnus*, p. 76, and Geor. Calixtus, *de Conjugio Clerici*, p. 170, &c. [Paphnutius, a bishop in the upper Thebaid, himself the inmate of a monastery from boyhood, and renowned for chastity, took, after all, a narrow view of the question; such a one, in fact, as was to be expected

§ 13. But the passions of men had a force too great for either the decrees of the Nicene council or the imperial authority. There were, accordingly, those who, though they did not otherwise agree with *Arius*, yet were dissatisfied with some things in the decrees and formularies of the council⁶; and the *Arians* left no means untried to heal the wound inflicted on them by these means. Nor did fortune refuse favour to their wishes; for in a few years after the Nicene council, a certain Arian priest, whom *Constantia*, the emperor's sister, at her death had recommended to the care of her brother, succeeded in persuading *Constantine* the Great, that *Arius* had been wrongfully condemned from personal enmity. Hence, in the year 330, the emperor recalled him from exile, rescinded the decrees passed against his associates and friends, and permitted *Eusebius* of Nicomedia, the principal supporter of *Arius*, and his powerful faction, now thirsting for revenge, to persecute the defenders of the Nicene council⁷. They assailed no one more fiercely than *Athanasius*,

from a considerate but prejudiced old man. He declared intercourse with a lawful wife to be chastity, and deprecated the separation of married persons, when the man took orders, as a yoke likely to injure the church, because all could not bear it. But then he denied all discretion as to marriage after ordination. The bachelor priest was to remain so; and the widow was not to marry again. These restrictions, he said, were according to the ancient tradition of the Church. This famous case, therefore, although evidence against Romish usage, responds but imperfectly to Protestant views. *Ed.*]

⁶ [The word *ὁμοούσιος*, (of the same essence,) in particular, was not agreeable to all. At first, seventeen bishops hesitated to subscribe the creed and the condemnation of *Arius*, because they wished to shun the appearance of favouring the Sabellian error; and they objected, that the word *ὁμοούσιος* had been disapproved of in the time of Paul of Samosata. (Socrates, *II. l. i. c. 8. 23*, &c. Basil, *Ep. 360*.) And, in fact, Paul of Samosata had abused the word *ὁμοούσιος*, to controvert any other distinction between the Son, or Word, and the Father, except the difference of names and of external relations in reference to the divine manifestation. And though it be not fully proved, that this term, in the Samosatian sense of it, was rejected by a council at

Antioch in the year 269, (which decision at Antioch is pronounced fabulous, by Dr. Feuerlein, in his *Dissert.* on the question, *Dei filium patri esse ὁμοούσιον antiqui ecclesie doctores in concilio Antiocheno utrum negaverint?* Gotting, 1755,) yet it is certain, that the *Arians* had before alleged this Antiochian decree, and no one had charged them with mistake in so doing. Nevertheless, those who were not pleased with the creed were generally brought to acquiesce in it, partly by the threats of the emperor, to banish all who would not subscribe, and partly by the advice of the princess *Constantia*. Only *Arius*, with the bishops *Theonas* and *Secundus*, persevered in a refusal. Yet some [namely, *Eusebius* of Nicomedia, and *Theognis*, bishop of Nice,] subscribed only the creed itself, and not also the anathema. *Schl.*]

⁷ [So sudden a change was not to be expected. The council of Nice had taken every precaution to prevent the further spread of Arianism; and its decrees had been approved by other councils in distant provinces, and thus had obtained the authority of decrees by the whole church. The emperor had superadded to the sentence of the bishops, civil penalties, ordering the recusants into exile; and had condemned the writings of *Arius* to the flames, and commanded them to be de-

the bishop of Alexandria. When this prelate could in no way be brought to restore *Arius* to his former honours and ecclesiastical standing, he was first deprived of his office in a council held at Tyre, A.D. 335, and then banished to Gaul; while in the same year, by a numerous council held at Jerusalem, *Arius* and his friends were solemnly admitted to the communion of the church. But by none of these proceedings could the Alexandrians be induced to receive *Arius* among their presbyters. Accordingly the emperor called him to Constantinople, in the year 336, and ordered *Alexander*, the bishop of that city, to open the doors of his church to him. But before that could take

livered up on pain of death. [See the emperor's letter to the bishops and people, in Socrates, *H. E.* i. 9.] Thus the Arian party seemed to be wholly suppressed. But it only *seemed* to be so. Four years after, the atmosphere about the court of Constantine at once became clear and serene to the Arians; and the causes of so great a change are not well known; for the history of Constantine here has a chasm of three years. The princess Constantia seems actually to have had a hand in this great revolution. The bishops who were favourably disposed towards Arius, had recommended themselves to her, by giving back in the Nicene council, and subscribing the creed, very much in compliance with her recommendation. (Philostorgius, *H. E.* i. c. 9.) This attention shown her would naturally pave the way for them to the confidence of the princess. And therefore the statement of Socrates (l. i. c. 25,) and Sozomen (l. iii. c. 19,) is not improbable; namely, that it was by her, and by an Arian priest whom she at her death recommended to him, that Constantine was brought to entertain more favourable views of the Arians. At the instigation of this priest, the emperor dispatched a gracious letter to Arius, bidding him come to the court. Arius hastened to Constantinople, with his friend Euzoius, and was graciously listened to by the emperor, whom he satisfied as to his orthodoxy. At the requisition of the emperor, they both presented a confession of their faith, which was so artfully drawn up, as to conceal their real sentiments under orthodox phraseology. In this way, Arius obtained permission to return to Alexandria. Antecedently to this, Eusebius,

bishop of Nicomedia, and Theognis, bishop of Nice, had obtained complete re-instatement in their offices; and the former now commenced persecuting the orthodox party, and especially Athanasius. The deposition of Athanasius was decreed by the council of Tyre; but his banishment was by order of the emperor, before whom he was accused of threatening to prevent the exportation of grain from Egypt to Constantinople. As Arius met with more opposition at Alexandria than he expected, and as his presence there caused commotions which seemed almost to amount to an insurrection, he was called back to Constantinople. Here he had another hearing before the emperor, and swore to a formula of faith presented by himself, which sounded very orthodox. The emperor was so well satisfied by this exhibition of Arius, that he sent for Alexander, the bishop of Constantinople, and earnestly enjoined upon him to admit Arius the next Sunday to his communion. The terrified bishop retired to the church of St. Irene, and there prayed that the calamity might be averted. On the day appointed, Arius, accompanied by Eusebius of Nicomedia and others of his adherents, proceeded through the principal streets of the city, in order to enter the church in triumph, and entertained his friends with playful discourse. But as he passed along, the calls of nature obliged him to step aside. He entered one of the public offices erected for such purposes, and left his servants waiting at the door; and here he died with a violent colic. See Dr. Walsh's *Histoire der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii. p. 486, &c. *Schl.*]

place, *Arius* died at Constantinople, in a tragical manner*. And the emperor himself closed life shortly after.

§ 14. After the death of *Constantine* the Great, one of his sons, *Constantius*, the emperor of the East, with his wife and his court, was very partial to the Arian cause; but *Constantine* and *Constans* supported, in the western parts, where they governed, the decisions of the Nicene council. Hence the broils, the

* Some of the moderns are disposed to call in question this account of *Arius'* death; but without good reason, since it is attested by such unexceptionable witnesses as Socrates, Sozomen, Athanasius and others. Yet the cause of his sudden and extraordinary death—for the miserable man is said to have discharged his own bowels—is a subject of much controversy. The ancients, who tell us that God, being moved by the prayers of holy men, miraculously avenged the wickedness of the man, will hardly find credit at this day among candid persons well acquainted with Arian affairs. When I consider all the circumstances of the case, I confess, that to me it appears most probable, the unhappy man lost his life by the machinations of his enemies, being destroyed by poison. An indiscreet and blind zeal in religion has, in every age, led on to many crimes worse than this. [The preceding account of *Arius'* death, and of the circumstances attending it, is given by Athanasius, (*Ep. ad Serapion. de morte Arij*, p. 522, &c. *Opp.* tom. ii. ed. Commelin,) by Socrates, (*Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 37, 38,) Sozomen, (*Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 29, 30,) by Theodoret, (*Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 15,) and by several other writers of the fourth century. The first in this list, and with him most of the others, draw a frightful picture of the manner of *Arius'* death, making him to have died by the falling out of all his bowels. Most of them regard it as a miracle, by which God punished him for his perjury, or hearkened to the prayers of bishop Alexander, who, with others, returned thanks to God for this deliverance. Is it not strange, that some moderns have moved the question, whether this whole narration, the chief source of which is found in the writings of the most strenuous opposer of *Arius*, and which respects a man then very much hated, may not be a fabrication? Yet the story is told with such uniformity as to the principal

facts, by those who differ in the minor circumstances of it; and the spot where he died was so generally pointed out even in the fifth century, according to Socrates, that we are not authorized to doubt the truth of the general statement. Yet it can by no means be proved, or indeed be made to appear probable, that the sudden death of *Arius* was miraculous, and a punishment inflicted by God. Sozomen himself tells us, that some at the time regarded it as the consequence of a disease, which directly affected the heart; others believed, that his sudden joy at finding his affairs issuing so happily, brought on him this speedy death. Very much is requisite to justify the ascription of an event, which may be explained by natural causes, to a supernatural, and to the hand of God inflicting a divine punishment. But under such circumstances, Christians have in all ages been too ready to make up such inconsiderate judgments. Besides, the death of *Arius* is painted as being as extraordinary as possible; and is not obscurely compared, by Athanasius in particular, with that of Judas the traitor; and on the other hand, the strange prayer of bishop Alexander against him, is not only passed without censure, but is represented as being a holy prayer which heaven answered. The adherents of *Arius* maintained, that his enemies compassed his death by magical arts: and in very recent times, discerning writers have conjectured that he was poisoned. This, however, is merely a conjecture, and one which is often made on occasion of the sudden and unexpected death of persons who had many or powerful enemies. Nothing more, therefore, can be regarded as certain, but this: *Arius* died a sudden death; but the cause of it is unknown." Translated from Schroeckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. v. p. 386, 387. Tr.]

commotions, the plots, the injuries, had neither measure nor bounds, and on both sides councils were assembled to oppose councils. *Constans* died in the year 350; and two years after, a great part of the West, particularly Italy and Rome, came under the dominion of his brother *Constantius*; and this revolution was most disastrous to the friends of the Nicene council. For this emperor, being devoted to the Arians, involved them in numerous evils and calamities, and by threats and punishments compelled many of them, and among others, as is well attested, the Roman pontiff, *Liberius*, to apostatize to that sect to which he was himself attached⁹. The Nicene party made no hesitation to return the same treatment, as soon as time, place, and opportunity were afforded them. And the history of Christianity under *Constantius* presents the picture of a most stormy period, and of a war among brethren, which was carried on without religion, or justice, or humanity¹.

§ 15. On the death of *Constantius*, in the year 362, the prosperous days of the Arians were at an end. *Julian* had no partialities for either, and therefore patronized neither the Arians nor the orthodox². *Jovian*³ espoused the orthodox sentiments: and therefore all the West, with no small part of the East, rejecting

⁹ [It appears from the Letters of *Liberius*, which are still extant, and from the testimony of Hilary of Poitiers, Jerome, and others, that *Liberius* boldly resisted the Arians, and was therefore banished to Beroea in Thrace; that, at the end of two years, his eagerness to return to his bishopric, led him to consent to the condemnation of Athanasius, and to subscribe the Arian creed set forth by the third council of Sirmium. This weakness in a Roman bishop has furnished the Protestants with an argument against the Catholic doctrine of papal infallibility, which they have not failed to urge successfully, and to the great annoyance of the Catholics. See, among others, Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i. p. 136, &c. *Tr.*]

¹ [The Orthodox and the Arians were constantly in the field, and they often came to bloodshed. The imperial brothers frequently patched up an external peace with each other; but the Christians, who, from the principles of their holy religion, should have been united in the closest bonds

of brotherhood and in unbroken peace, were engaged in unceasing war during the reign of these emperors. The victorious party oppressed the vanquished with false accusations, banishments, deprivations of office, anathemas of councils, artifice, and violence. For proof the reader is referred to Athanasius, *Apology ad Constant.* p. 307, &c. *Historia Arianorum ad Monach.* p. 373, &c. 393, &c. Sozomen, *H. E.* lib. iv. c. 9. 19. Socrates, *H. E.* lib. ii. c. 37, and the dark picture of the state of the church, by Vincentius Lirinensis, in his *Commonit.* c. 6. *Schl.*]

² [Julian, who wished to make himself popular, and to ruin the Christian church by its internal contests, not only gave all sects of Christians entire liberty of conscience, but likewise recalled all the banished. And this was greatly for the advantage of the orthodox, especially in the West, where the churches again recovered their bishops, and such of them as had renounced orthodoxy through fear, returned again to the profession of it. *Schl.*]

³ [*A. D.* 363, 364. *Tr.*]

Arian views, reverted to the doctrines of the Nicene council⁴. But the scene was changed under the two brothers, *Valentinian*⁵ and *Valens*⁶, who were advanced to the government of the empire in the year 364. *Valentinian* adhered to the decisions at Nice; and therefore, in the West, the Arian sect, a few churches excepted, was wholly extirpated. *Valens*, on the contrary, took sides with the Arians; and hence in the eastern provinces, many calamities befel the orthodox⁷. But when this emperor had fallen in a war with the Goths, A. D. 378, *Gratian*⁸ restored peace to the orthodox⁹. After him *Theodosius* the Great¹, by depriving the Arians of all their churches, and enacting severe laws against them², caused the decisions of the Nicene council to triumph everywhere, and none could any longer publicly profess Arian doctrines, except among the barbarous nations, Goths³,

⁴ [The Arians in the East took great pains to draw Jovian over to their side; but as these attempts proved fruitless, various individuals of them, and in particular Acacius, were induced to yield assent to the Nicene creed. The Arians of Alexandria also in vain laboured to bring Athanasius into disgrace; and he was in high favour till the emperor's death. *Schl.*]

⁵ [In the West. *Tr.*]

⁶ [In the East. *Tr.*]

⁷ [The persecutions of Valens extended, not only to the orthodox, but also to the Semi-Arians, and other minor parties: and the Semi-Arians, after much negotiation, resorted to the unexpected measure of sending messengers to Rome, and by subscribing to the Nicene creed, attempted to form a coalition with the occidental Christians. But this coalition was frustrated, partly by the repugnance of some of the Semi-Arians to the word *ὁμοούσιος*, and partly by the exertions of the powerful Arians at court; and a new persecution ensued. The orthodox ventured to make a representation to the emperor Valens, and for this purpose sent a delegation, composed of eighty clergymen, to the court of Nicomedia. The emperor cruelly ordered Modestus, the prætorian prefect, to put them all to death, but without noise; which he accomplished by putting them on board a vessel, and when at sea, causing the vessel and all the unhappy men to be burnt. Such cruelty, perhaps, is without a parallel among the persecutions by the pagans. See Socrates,

H. E. iv. c. 15. Sozomen, *H. E.* vi. c. 13. Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. c. 21. and Dr. Walch, *Histoire der Ketzereien*, vol. ii. p. 543, &c. *Schl.*]

⁸ [Who succeeded Valentinian in the West, in the year 376, and became master of the whole empire in 378. *Tr.*]

⁹ [Gratian granted religious freedom to all his subjects at the commencement of his reign, and excluded only the Manicheans, the Photinians, and the Eusebians from the liberty of holding assemblies for worship. He also recalled all the bishops whom Valens had banished. Some of the Semi-Arians now again held their own synods, and renewed their confession of faith, that the Son is of like essence [*ὁμοούσιος*] with the Father, in a council held at Antioch in Caria. On the other hand, the orthodox again set up public worship in Constantinople, and obtained the zealous Gregory Nazianzen for their bishop. Gratian, at length, forbade the assemblies of the heretics, without distinction. *Code de Theodos.* l. v. de *Hæret.* and the Notes of Godefroi, tom. vi. p. 128. Walch, *Hist. der Ketz.* vol. ii. p. 547, &c. *Schl.*]

¹ [A. D. 383–395. *Tr.*]

² See *Code de Theodos.* tom. vi. p. 5. 10. 130. 146. and Godefroi, Notes on these laws. [See also Dr. Walch, *Histoire der Ketzereien*, vol. ii. p. 549, &c. *Schl.*]

³ [The Goths were on this occasion entangled in the Arian heresy. Being driven by the Huns from their former residence on the Tanais, they sent an embassy to the emperor Valens, and

Vandals¹, and Burgundians². That there were great faults on both sides in this long and violent contest, no candid person can deny; but which party was the heavier offender, it is difficult to say³.

§ 16. The Arians would have done much more harm to the church, if they had not become divided among themselves, after

obtained liberty to plant themselves on the banks of the Danube; promising, not only to serve the Romans in their wars, but to embrace the Christian religion, as soon as teachers should be sent among them. Uphilas was one of their ambassadors, who was himself an Arian, and Valens also gave him only Arian teachers for his assistants. It was not strange, therefore, that the Arian doctrine obtained so great currency among this people. The subsequent history of Arianism among them, is related by Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. ii. p. 553. *Schl.*]

⁴ [Neither the time nor the circumstances in which this people embraced Christianity, can be ascertained. Only thus much is certain, that they were, in great measure, believers in Christianity, before they came into France; (Salvianus, *de Ira Dei*, lib. vii. p. 845 and 228.) And from a passage in Jordanes, (*de Rebus Geticis*, c. 25,) it is probable, that they got their first knowledge of Christianity from their neighbours the Goths, and according to the Arian principles. They were persecutors of the orthodox; which cannot be said of the Goths. See Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. ii. p. 559, &c. *Schl.*]

⁵ [These first settled permanently in Gaul, during the next century, and there first embraced the Christian religion, and according to the orthodox system. Orosius, lib. viii. c. 32, and the history of the fifth century, *infra*, pt. i. chap. i. § 4. But their intercourse with the neighbouring Arians, the West Goths, infected them with the leaven of Arianism. Yet under the successors of their king Gundebold, the orthodox doctrine again got the upper hand; and under the domination of the Franks, the adherents to Arian principles were wholly rooted out. See Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. ii. p. 564, &c. *Schl.*]

⁶ [The judgment pronounced by Dr. Walch, in the 2nd vol. of his *Historie*

der Ketzeren, p. 698, is so sound and impartial, that I cannot refrain from inserting it here without alteration. "The modern Arians in England blacken the character of Athanasius too much, in order to discredit his doctrine; other writers, too much prepossessed with the idea that a Calendar saint must be an angel, represent this man and his adherents as absolutely faultless. If we would judge impartially, both parties were chargeable with the dreadful consequences of this contest. There was a total want of moderation throughout; every where the mistaken notion reigned, that it is right to exercise control over the consciences of others; every where private matters were treated as public affairs of the church; every where the authority of ecclesiastical councils was misused; and still more, that of civil magistrates; every where, therefore, a persecuting spirit was cherished and maintained. In particular, we believe, that these faults commenced on the side of the orthodox; that other bishops too hastily became linked in with Alexander; and that in the council of Sardica, too little respect was paid to the wishes of the oriental bishops in respect to Athanasius, which were, that he might not sit and vote in the council, because he was the accused person. But the Arians were guilty of still greater offences. Arius was in fault, for so zealously endeavouring to create a party; but Eusebius of Nicomedia was, in our opinion, a real fire-brand, who set the whole in a flame; and the suspicion, that pride and love of distinction led him to defend Arius, and produced that obstinacy in supporting the side he took, appears to us well founded. In short, this history very forcibly inculcates the necessity of uniting true benevolence to men, with our zeal for the truth, and the avoiding of all personal animosities, by presenting to us so many lamentable occurrences and so very unhappy consequences, arising from the neglect of these Christian duties." Walch, *ubi supra*. *Schl.*]

the Nicene council, and split into sects which could not endure each other. The ancients enumerate as Arian sects, the *Semi-Arians*, the *Eusebians*⁷, the *Ælians*, the *Eunomians*, the *Acacians*⁸, the *Psathyrians*⁹, and others. But they may all be reduced to three classes. The first class embraces the old and *genuine Arians*; who, rejecting all new terms and modes of expression, taught explicitly, that the Son was *not begotten* by the Father, but *created* or formed out of nothing¹. From these deviated, on the one side, the *Semi-Arians*; and on the other, the *Eunomians* or *Anomeans*, that is, the disciples of *Eunomius*, a man of acuteness, and of *Ælius*. The *former* maintained, that the Son of God was *ὁμοούσιος*, i. e. of *like essence* with the Father; yet

⁷ [These derived their name from two bishops named Eusebius, the one of Cæsarea, and the father of church history; the other of Nicomedia, and afterwards of Constantinople, and intimate with Constantine the Great. These belonged to the class of *Semi-Arians*; called, at this day, *Subordinationists*, because they maintained a *subordination* among the persons of the Godhead. Yet this name was applied to all who opposed the Nicene doctrine, and who disapproved either of the word *ὁμοούσιος* only, or also the idea it was used for. *Schl.*]

⁸ [These bore the name of Acacius, a bishop of Cæsarea, and successor of Eusebius Pamphili. He allowed that the Son was like the Father; but only in respect to his *will*. *Schl.*]

⁹ [This word imports *pastry-cooks*; because a person of this occupation, a Syrian, named Theoktistus, was particularly zealous in defending one of the minor parties of Arians in Constantinople, which maintained that God the Father existed before the Son had a being. *Schl.*]

¹ [Arius maintained, there were *three* substances in God, namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The *first* is the only eternal God. There is, absolutely, none like him; and his essence is incomprehensible. He is called the *Father*, in a sense corresponding with that in which the Son is called the *Son*; and as the latter was not always the Son, so the former was not always the Father. The *second* substance is the person who is denominated in the Scriptures, the Son, the Word, and the Wisdom of God. He is absolutely a

creature of God; and one whom God created, as he did the other creatures, immediately from nothing. This creation of the Son, the Scriptures denominate a *generation*; and this creature is called the *Son* of God, in a figurative sense of the word, because God has *adopted* him. The terms *Word* and *Wisdom* of God, are ambiguous; for they sometimes denote certain powers or attributes of God, and sometimes a person, namely, the Son. In the former acceptation, they are inherent in God, naturally and necessarily; but not so in the latter acceptation. God, of his voluntary choice, produced this person, to be an instrument in his hand in the creation of the world. The Son, therefore, is, in his essence, totally different from the Father. As a rational creature, he possesses free will, is changeable, and so might become either vicious or virtuous; though, by his diligence and his long practice, he has acquired permanent habits of virtue. And God has chosen for his Son, the most virtuous of all created spirits. Thus the Son, according to Arius' views, is not truly God, not eternal, not omniscient. There are, to his understanding, some mysteries; and he does not comprehend clearly the essence of the Father, nor his own nature. Yet God has graciously imparted to him pre-eminent gifts. Thereby he is become the Son of God; nay, obtained for himself the name of *God*; though not in the proper sense of the word. Such is Dr. Walch's representation of the doctrine of Arius; in his *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. ii. p. 569, &c. *Schl.*]

not by nature, but only by grace. The leaders of this party were *George* of Laodicea, and *Basil* of Ancyra². The latter, who were also called pure Arians, *Aëtians*³, and *Eueontians*⁴, contended that Christ was ἑτεροούσιος or ἀνόμοιος, i. e. *dissimilar*, both in *essence* and in other respects, to the Father⁵. Under each of these classes there were other subordinate sects, whose subtleties and refinements have been but obscurely developed by the ancient writers. This discord among the Arians was as injurious to their cause, as the confutations and the zeal of the orthodox.

§ 17. Unhappily, the Arian contests produced, as was very natural, some new sects. Some persons, eager to avoid and overthrow the opinions of *Arius*, fell into opinions equally dangerous. Others, after treading in the footsteps of *Arius*, ventured on far beyond him, and exceeded his offences. The human mind, weak, powerless, and subject to the control of the senses and the imagination, seldom exerts all its energies to comprehend

² See Prud. Marau, *Dissert. sur les Semi-Ariens*; which has been reprinted by Joh. Voigt, in *Biblioth. Hæresiol.* tom. ii. p. 119, &c. [The Semi-Arians were also called *moderate Arians*; and *Eusebians*, because the Eusebiuses, especially the one of Cæsarea, supported this party; and Homœousians, from the word ὁμοούσιος, which was, as it were, their symbol. *George* of Laodicea was a native of Alexandria, and a very learned man. He had personal difficulties with bishop Alexander, and obtained the bishopric of Laodicea, through the Eusebian party, to which he devoted himself. Basil, bishop of Ancyra, had the reputation of an upright and learned man, and was in great favour with the emperor Constantius. He can be taxed with no other fault, than that of not tolerating the word ὁμοούσιος. He drew on himself much persecution by his zealous opposition to Photinus and to the genuine Arians; and was deprived of his office by the Acacians. *Schl.*]

³ [They had this name from their chief person, Aëtius of Antioch. This man applied himself to the sciences at Alexandria, and acquainted himself with the medical art, as well as with theology. As all his instructors were of Arian sentiments, he also applied his talents and his dexterity in debate to the vindication of the Arian doctrines. He was made a deacon at An-

tioc; but the Semi-Arians and the orthodox hated him, and he was deposed and banished in the reign of Constantius. Julian recalled him, and gave him a bishopric. He had the surname of the *Atheist*. Socrates, *H. E.* i. c. 35. Sozomen, *H. E.* iii. c. 15, &c.; and iv. c. 23. *Schl.*]

⁴ [This name is derived from the Greek words ἔξ οὐκ ὄντων. They said, that the Son of God might indeed be called *God*, and the *Word of God*; but only in a sense consistent with his having been brought forth ἔξ οὐκ ὄντων [*from non-existences*]; that is, that he was one of those things which *once had no existence*; and of, course, that he was properly a *creature*, and was once a *non-entity*. *Schl.*]

⁵ See Ja. Basnage, *Diss. de Eunomius*, in Henr. Canisius, *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. i. p. 172, &c., where are extant the creed and an apology of Eunomius. See also J. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Gr.* vol. viii. p. 100—143; and *Contra Theod.* tom. vi. p. 147, 155, 157, 167, 200, &c. [Eunomius, a Cappadocian, was a scholar of Aëtius, and was made bishop of Cyzicum by his partizans. But he was soon displaced, and his whole life was full of unpleasant occurrences. He was peculiarly lucid in his style, and his writings are, on that account, the most valuable documents for the history of Arianism. *Schl.*—See note, p. 333. *Tr.*]

divine subjects, in such a manner as to be duly guarded against extremes. To the former class I would refer *Apollinaris* the younger, bishop of Laodicea, though otherwise a man of great merit, and one who in various ways rendered important service to the church⁶. He manfully asserted the divinity of *Christ*, against the Arians; but by philosophizing too freely and too eagerly, he almost set aside his humanity. He maintained, that *Christ* assumed only a human body, endowed with a sentient soul, but not possessed of intellect; and that the divine nature in *Christ* did the office of a rational soul or mind⁷: whence it seemed to follow, that the divine nature became mingled with the human⁸, and with the human nature suffered pain and death. This great man was led astray, not merely by the ardour of debate, but likewise by his immoderate attachment to the Platonic doctrine concerning a two-fold soul; from which, if the divines of that age had been free, they would have formed more wise and more correct judgments on many points. Some among the ancients attribute other errors besides this to *Apollinaris*; but how much credit is due to them is doubtful⁹. The doctrine

⁶ [See a sketch of his life and writings, above, p. 331, note ². *Tr.*]

⁷ [*Apollinaris* believed that *Christ* had no need of a rational soul, because the divine nature was competent to all the rational and free acts which the Saviour performed; and he could see no reason why *Christ* must have had two intelligent natures and two free wills. He supposed further, that a rational human soul, as it was the seat of sinful acts, was liable to moral changes; and therefore *Christ*, if he had possessed a rational human soul, could not have had an unchangeable, that is, a sinless, human nature. And he supported his opinion by the many passages of Scripture which speak of *Christ's* becoming man, in which only the word *σάρξ*, *flesh*, is used for the human nature; e. g. *John* i. 14. These arguments needed an answer; but his opposers replied to them very imperfectly. They showed, indeed, from the Bible, that *Christ* had a rational human soul. But their proof was defective in this, that they did not show, that by the word *ψυχῆ*, in the Scriptures, must necessarily be understood a rational soul. And what they brought forward beside this, were either the bad consequences that would follow,

or occasions for logomachy, which rather retarded than furthered the discovery of truth. See *Walch, Historie der Ketzerreg.*, vol. iii. p. 186, &c. *Schl.*]

⁸ [This consequence, however, *Apollinaris* did not admit. He was indeed accused of denying the actual distinction of the two natures, and of holding to such a confusion of them, as *Eutyches* afterwards maintained. But he rejected the term *mixture*; and expressly taught, that he did not subvert the doctrine of two distinct natures in *Christ*, but that the divinity remained divine, and the flesh remained flesh. See *Dr. Walch, Historie der Ketzerreg.*, vol. iii. p. 193, &c. *Schl.*]

⁹ See *J. Basmage, Historia Hæresis Apollinaris*; which is republished with some learned additions, by *Jo. Voigt, Biblioth. Hæresiologicalæ*, tom. i. fascic. i. p. 1—96. See also *ibid.* tom. i. fascic. iii. p. 607. The laws against the *Apollinarians* are extant in the *Codex Theodos.*, tom. vi. p. 144, &c. See likewise (*Chaufepie*.) *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. et Crit.* tom. i. p. 304, &c. ["See an account of *Apollinaris*, and his heresy, in the English edition of *Bayle's Dictionary*, at the article *Apollinaris*."] *MacL.*—Concerning this sect, *Dr. Walch* has treated most solidly, and with the

of *Apollinaris* met the approbation of many, in nearly all the eastern provinces; and being explained in different ways, it became the source of new sects. But as it was assailed by the laws of the emperors, the decrees of councils, and the writings of learned men, it gradually sank under these united assaults.

§ 18. In the same class must be reckoned *Marcellus*, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia¹; if confidence may be placed in *Eusebius* of Cæsarea, and in his other adversaries, who tell us, that he so explained the mystery of the holy Trinity, as to fall into the Sabellian and Samosatenian errors. Yet there are many who think, that both *Eusebius* of Nicomedia and *Eusebius* of Cæsarea unfairly represent his sentiments, because he gave offence by the severity of his attacks upon the Arians and upon the bishops who favoured them. But, admitting that his accusers were influenced in some respects by their hatred of the man, yet it is certain that their accusations were not altogether groundless. For it appears, from a careful examination of the whole subject, that *Marcellus* considered the Son and the Holy Spirit as two emanations from the divine nature, which, after performing their

application of impartial criticism, in his *Histoire der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 119—229. *Schl.*]

¹ [This *Marcellus* was a person of weight in the Nicene council, and there opposed the Arians with a zeal and energy which procured him praise from his own party, and hatred and obloquy from the opposite side. (See *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* lxxii. c. 2. *Athanas.* *Apolog. contra Arian.* tom. i. pt. ii. p. 135, 150, and *Constantine*, *Epist. Pontif.* p. 379. 383.) *Asterius*, a defender of the Arian doctrine, attacked him in writing, and accused him of Sabellianism. *Marcellus* in reply wrote a book to defend the true doctrine respecting the subordination of Jesus Christ to the Father. In the year 336, the Arian bishops assembled at Constantinople deposed him, as one convicted of the Sabellian or Samosatenian heresy, and elected *Basil* in his place. After the death of *Constantius*, he recovered his see; but lost it again almost immediately, as the *Eusebians* again got the ascendancy. He now fled to Rome, and exhibited a confession of his faith to the bishop *Julius*, by whom, with the other bishops of the *Athanasian* party assembled at Rome,

he was recognized as orthodox, and as a sufferer for the truth. On the other hand, the eastern bishops persevered in their criminations of him. In the year 347, the western bishops at the council of Sardica again pronounced him innocent. But when *Plotinus*, a pupil of *Marcellus*, commenced his disturbance, *Athanasius* now first threw out some suspicions, that his doctrine was not pure; but he soon dropped them. *Basil* the Great, however, was more decided in his opposition to *Marcellus*, and held him to be actually a heretic. Yet he afterwards acknowledged himself in the wrong. *Marcellus* and his friends took pains to procure testimony, from influential men and from churches, to their orthodoxy; and they were not unsuccessful. *Marcellus* was, in reality, not without considerable learning; but his judgment was weak, and he had the habit of talking at random, and was at the same time very bitter against his antagonists. It is, therefore, not only possible, but also very probable, that he often let drop faulty expressions, which in the view of his enemies contained dangerous errors. See *Waleh*, *Histoire der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 232, &c. *Schl.*]

respective offices, were to return back into the substance of the Father: and whoever believed so, could not, without self-contradiction, hold the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to differ from each other in the manner of distinct persons². *Marcellus* increased the odium and suspicions against him, by refusing, in the last years of his life, to condemn *Photinus* his disciple³.

§ 19. At the head of those whom the contests with *Arius* led into still greater errors, may undoubtedly be placed *Photinus*, bishop of Sirmium⁴, who, in the year 343, advanced opinions concerning God equally remote from those of the orthodox and those of the Arians. On well considering what the ancients have stated without much perspicuity or uniformity, it appears, that he supposed *Jesus Christ* to have been born of the virgin *Mary*, by the Holy Spirit; that with this extraordinary man, a certain divine *emanation*, which he called the *Word*, became united; that, on account of this union of the *Word* with the man *Jesus*, he was called the *Son of God*, and also *God*; and that the Holy Spirit was a virtue or *energy*, proceeding from God, and not a *person*⁵. The temerity of the man was chastised,

² [It is nevertheless uncertain, whether *Marcellus* really denied the personal distinctions in the Trinity. The accusations of his opposers are not credible evidence in this case. *Marcellus* and his friends constantly denied that they were Sabellians. He denied, indeed, that they were three ὑποστάσεις, affirming that there was but one ὑπόστασις. But this word had then so indeterminate a meaning, that nothing certain can be inferred from it. For it denoted, sometimes, what we should call *substance*; and at other times, was equivalent to *person*. Dr. Walch, *ubi supra*, p. 290, thinks it probable, as *Marcellus* always strenuously contended, and with justice, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are ἀδιαίρετος and ἀχωρίστος, (inseparably) united, he must have regarded the word ὑπόστασις as equivalent to the phrase ὑπόστασις διστώσα, a different substance. Yet clearly he often used unsuitable descriptions and comparisons respecting the eternal generation of the Son, and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son; and such as seem to show, that he understood by these persons only certain attributes and acts of God. But perhaps these were only unfortunate expressions,

or errors of the moment, from which he would give back, when the heat of contest subsided. *Schl.*]

³ See Bernh. de Montfaucon, *Diatribæ de causa Marcelli*; in the *Nora Collectio Patrum Græcor.* tom. ii. p. 51, &c. [re-published with some notes, by Voigt, *Biblioth. Hæresiol.* vol. i. fascie. ii. p. 297. *Schl.*] and Ja. Gervaise, *Vie de S. Epiphane*, p. 42, &c. [Add also, Walch, *Hist. der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 229—239, and Chr. Hen. Vogel's Disputation at Gottingen, 1757, de *Marcello Ancyre Episcopo*. *Schl.*]

⁴ [Yet *Photinus* was not a native of Sirmium, as some have supposed, being misled by a faulty Latin version of a passage in Epiphanius, *de Hæres.* lxxi. § 1. He was rather a Galatian, (Jerome, *de Vitis Illustr.* c. 107, and Socrates, *H. E.* ii. c. 18,) and most probably of Ancyra. He was an author; but his writings are lost. And he was eloquent, and had an excellent faculty at securing the affections and making proselytes among his hearers. See Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 9, &c. *Schl.*]

⁵ [To give a more distinct view of the opinions of *Photinus*, we will here state them as they are arranged by Dr.

not only by the orthodox, in their councils of Antioch, A.D. 345, of Milan, A.D. 347, and of Sirmium⁶, but also by the Arians, in a council held at Sirmium, A.D. 351. He was deprived of his office, and died in exile in the year 372⁷.

§ 20. After him, *Macedonius*, bishop of Constantinople, a distinguished Semi-Arian teacher, being deprived of his office, through the influence of the Eunomians, by the council of Constantinople, in the year 360⁸, founded in his exile the sect

Walch, *loc. cit.* p. 34. Photinus had (1.) erroneous views of the *Trinity*. On this subject he taught thus:—The holy Scriptures speak indeed of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; but we are to understand by them, only *one person*, who in Scripture is called the Father. What the Scriptures call the *Word* of God, is by no means a substance or a *person*. Still less is it a person *begotten* by the Father, and therefore called the Son. For with God there can be no generation; and of course he can have no Son. Neither is the Word that person who made the world; but the *Word* is properly the *understanding* of God; which comprehends the designs of God in all his external operations, and is therefore called God. The Holy Spirit also is not a *person*, but an attribute of God. Hence followed (II.) erroneous ideas of the *person* of Christ. He maintained, that Jesus Christ was a *mere man*; that before his birth he had no existence, except in the divine foreknowledge; and that he began to *be*, when he was born of Mary by the Holy Spirit. Yet he received the special influences of divine power, whereby he wrought miracles. This is the indwelling of the *Word*. On account of these excellent gifts and his perfect virtue, God took this man into the place of a son; and therefore he is called the *Son of God*, and also *God*. Therefore it must be said, that the Son of God had a beginning. *Schl.*

⁶ [Concerning the time and succession of these councils, there has been much debate between Petavius, Sirmund, la Roque, and others; of which an account is given by Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. iii. p. 5, &c. We will only add, in correction of Mosheim's statements; 1st, that the earliest of these councils was held in the year 343; as appears from three documents, first brought to light by Maffei; and 2ndly,

that it was held by the Semi-Arians. So that the first orthodox council against Photinus was that of Milan. In that of Sirmium, the eastern bishops were assembled; and they pronounced Photinus a heretic. Photinus when adjudged to be deprived of his office and sent into exile, made application to the emperor, and obtained leave publicly to defend his doctrine. Basil, bishop of Ancyra, was appointed to dispute with him, and a formal discussion took place. Both parties became angry; but the victory was adjudged to Basil; and the former decision was affirmed. See Walch, *loc. cit.* p. 51, &c. *Schl.*]

⁷ Matth. de la Roque, *de Photino, ejusque multiplici damnatione*, Geneva, 1670, 8vo. Tho. Ittig, *Historia Photini*, in his *Septas Dissertationum*, subjoined to his *Diss. de Heresiarchis Eccl. Apostolica*. [We may add, Petavius, *Diss. de Photino heretico, ejusque damnatione*; in his *Rationarium Temporum*, 3rd edit. and among the *Opuscula* of Peter de Marca, [vol. v. p. 183, &c. ed. Bamberg, 1789; where it is accompanied with the two *Diatribæ* of Sirmund, respecting the councils of Sirmium;] and Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. iii. p. 1—70. *Schl.*]

⁸ There were several persons of the name of Macedonius, who should not be confounded with this man. The most noted of them were Macedonius of Mopsuestia, a contemporary with our Macedonius, and also involved in the Arian contests; (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 19,) and Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople in the reign of the emperor Anastasius, [A.D. 491—518.] by whom he was banished for his zeal against the Eutychians. The election of our Macedonius was attended with disorders which merit notice. This metropolis had one Paul for its bishop, who was deposed by the emperor Constantius, and Eusebius of Nicomedia

of the *Pneumatomachi*. For he now openly professed what he had before concealed, that the *Holy Spirit* is a *divine energy* diffused throughout the universe, and not a *person* distinct from the Father and the Son⁹. This doctrine was embraced by

chosen in his place. After the death of Eusebius, the orthodox replaced Paul in his office; but the Eusebian bishops appointed Macedonius. The emperor Constantius was displeased with the movement of the orthodox, and ordered his general, Hermogenes, to drive Paul from the city. And as his adherents made opposition, and the general had to use force, there was a general insurrection, which cost both sides much blood. The orthodox populace set fire to the general's house, and dragged him about the streets, with a rope around his neck, and finally killed him. The emperor now came himself to Constantinople, drove Paul from the city, and punished the people. And he also refused to establish Macedonius in the office, because he had given occasion to the bloodshed; but, he allowed him to remain in the city, and to hold worship in one of the churches which was assigned him. (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. c. 13, and Sozomen, *H. E.* iii. c. 8.) Paul returned again to Constantinople, and was again chased away by the soldiery; and on the other hand, Macedonius was, in the year 342, re-instated by an imperial general, which occasioned another massacre, in which more than 3000 persons lost their lives. But as Constantius was compelled by his brother Constans to re-instate the orthodox bishops, Paul shared in this good fortune, and Macedonius with his adherents had to content themselves with a single church to worship in. After the death of Constans, Paul was again displaced, and Macedonius once more seated in the episcopal chair. Here, confiding in the protection of the emperor, he stirred up a general persecution against the adherents to the Nicene creed, which extended to the provinces adjacent to Constantinople. (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. c. 26, 27, 33, and Sozomen, *H. E.* iv. c. 20, 26.) In the year 356, that church at Constantinople, in which was placed the coffin of Constantine the Great, seemed ready to fall down, and Macedonius therefore would remove the coffin. Some, including the orthodox party, maintained that this removal was improper and irregular, being influenced partly by

respect for the deceased emperor, and partly by hatred against Macedonius. But as Macedonius, notwithstanding, had proceeded to the removal, and had brought the coffin into another church, the two parties came to blows in the latter church, and such a slaughter was there made, that the porch was filled with dead bodies. This unfortunate step drew upon Macedonius the emperor's displeasure. (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. c. 33. Sozomen, *H. E.* iv. c. 21.) About this time, the disagreement among the opposers of the Nicene faith came to an open rupture; and Basil of Ancyra, the leader of the Semi-Arians, drew Macedonius over to his party. (Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. c. 9.) From this time onward, Macedonius held a high rank among the Semi-Arians, and supported their cause in the council of Seleucia. But he thus drew on himself such hatred from the whole Arian party, that they, in the year 360, with Acacius and Eudoxius at their head, deprived him of his office at Constantinople. Macedonius was very restless under this, and laboured to establish the Semi-Arians by defending their opinions; and this gave occasion for the Semi-Arians to be sometimes called *Macedonians*. He died soon afterwards. See Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. iii. p. 74, &c. *Schl.*]

⁹ Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iv. c. iv. [For a more full exhibition of the Macedonian doctrines, we will subjoin the statement of Dr. Walch, *loc. cit.* p. 96. As to their doctrine concerning the *Son of God*, some Macedonians agreed with the adherents to the Nicene fathers; but others, and among them Macedonius himself, coincided with the mildest form of the Semi-Arian creed. In regard to the Holy Spirit, they departed wholly from the opinions of the orthodox. Some indeed did not declare themselves in regard to the divinity of the Holy Spirit. They did not expressly deny that he was God; and yet they hesitated to affirm it. And this was no unusual thing. Even Basil the Great would not recommend to have the name of God used in public of the Holy Spirit, nor condemn those who refused thus to

many in the Asiatic provinces. But the council of Constantinople, assembled by *Theodosius* the Great, in the year 381, and which is commonly considered as the *second œcumenical* council, soon dissipated by its authority this sect, while yet but rising into notice. One hundred and fifty bishops, present in this council, defined fully and perfectly the doctrine of three persons in one God, which still is professed by the great body of Christians; a thing, by the Nicene council only done in part. They also anathematized all the heresies then known; assigned to the bishop of Constantinople, on account of the grandeur of the city over which he presided, a rank next after the bishop of Rome; and made such other regulations as the general interests of the church seemed to require¹.

use it. Nor would Gregory disapprove this. See Petavius, *Doctr. Theolog.* lib. i. de Trinitate, c. 10, tom. ii. p. 45, 64, and Semler, *Eindeitung zum 3ten Theil der Baumgarten's Polemik*, p. 173, 183. Others who did declare themselves, affirmed that the Holy Spirit was not a person in the Godhead: that he was not what the Father and the Son are; and therefore no divine honours were due to him. Some held the Holy Spirit to be a creature; and therefore did not deny his personality. Others denied his personality, and regarded him as a mere attribute of God. *Schl.*—"Whether or not the Macedonians explicitly denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit is uncertain; but they viewed him as essentially separate from, and external to, the one indivisible Godhead. Accordingly, the Creed, (which is that since incorporated in the public services of the church) without declaring more than the occasion required, closes all speculations concerning the incomprehensible subject, by simply confessing his *unity with the Father and Son*. It declares, moreover, that he is the *Lord, or sovereign Spirit*, because the heretics considered him to be but a minister of God; and the supreme *Giver of life*, because they considered him a mere instrument, by whom we received the gift. The last clause of the second paragraph in the Creed is directed against the heresy of Marcellus of Ancyra." Newman's *Arians of the fourth Century*, 420. Ed.]

¹ Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. v. c. 8. Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vii. c. 7. [The Macedonians led an externally good and strict life; and by promoting monkery,

obtained such reputation for piety, agreeably to the taste of that age, as contributed much to their popularity in Constantinople and its vicinity. After their separation from the Arians, and after their attempt to unite themselves with the orthodox had failed, they spread themselves considerably, especially in Thracæ, along the Hellespont, and in Phrygia. In the western provinces they were not found. At Constantinople they had their own churches and bishops. Among the attempts to reclaim the Macedonians from their errors, the most noticeable was that of the second general council at Constantinople. The emperor Theodosius hoped they might be won over more readily than the Arians, because they differed less from the orthodox. He therefore called Macedonian bishops to the council. There were thirty-six of them present; and much pains was taken to persuade them to embrace the Nicene decisions. But all efforts were vain; they declared that they would sooner embrace the Arian than the Nicene faith. And hence their doctrine was opposed in this synod by an addition made to the Nicene creed, and by expressed forms of condemnation. With these ecclesiastical weapons against the Macedonians, worldly ones were combined. In the statutes of the elder Theodosius, (lib. xi. xii. xiii. *Codiciis Theodos. de Hæreticis*), they are mentioned by name; and in those of the younger Theodosius, which are inserted in the *Codex Theodosianus*, (lib. lix. lx. lxxv.) it will be seen that they still existed, but could hold worship only in the principal cities.

§ 21. The frenzy of the ancient Gnostics, which had been so often driven out of sight, revived again in Spain. In the beginning of this century, one *Mark*, a native of Memphis, introduced it from Egypt, and communicated it first to a few individuals. After making considerable progress, and even infecting some persons renowned for piety and learning, it was imbibed by *Priscillian*, a man of birth, fortune, and eloquence, afterwards bishop of Avila. Being accused by some bishops before the emperor *Gratian*, *Priscillian* and his followers were banished from Spain: but he returned soon after. Accused again, in the year 384, before *Maximus* (the usurper in Gaul, after the assassination of *Gratian*), he was condemned, with several of his associates, and executed at Treves, in the year 385. The instigators of this punishment were, however, regarded with abhorrence by the bishops of Gaul and Italy: for it was not yet regarded among Christians as a pious and righteous act, to deliver heretics over to the civil power to be punished².

These civil regulations gave the ill-disposed bishops too much liberty to manifest their persecuting spirit towards the Macedonians, and enabled them wholly to exterminate them, it would seem, under these emperors. See Wach, *Historie der Ketzereien*, vol. iii. p. 70—118; and respecting the council of Constantinople, his *Historie der Kirchensammlungen*, p. 224, &c. The decrees of this council are given in Beveridge's *Pandecta Canonum*, tom. i. p. 85. *Schl.*—The first decree respects the creed and anathemas; the second confines bishops to their provinces; the third gives the bishop of Constantinople the rank of *second patriarch*. The four remaining decrees are of less importance. *Tr.*—"From the date of this council, Arianism was formed into a sect exterior to the Catholic church; and taking refuge among the barbarian invaders of the empire, is merged among those external enemies of Christianity, whose history cannot be regarded as strictly ecclesiastical." Newman's *Arians of the fourth Century*, 421. *Ed.*

² See Sulpitius Severus, *Hist. Sacra*, l. ii. c. 46, 51, and Dialog. iii. *de Vita Martini*, c. 15. [Priscillian had ability to present his doctrine with so much dexterity and eloquence, that he gained many friends both among the high and the low; and his sentiments were soon spread through all Spain. Among his

adherents there were some bishops, particularly Instantius and Salvianus, and many ladies of respectability. Hyginus, bishop of Corduba, who afterwards went over to the Priscillianists, was the first to oppose his doctrine; and for this purpose made a representation of it to Idacius, the bishop of Merida, who, by his rash violence against bishop Instantius, blew the fire of the Priscillianist war into a great flame. After many and long contests, a council was held at Saragossa in 380, at which the Priscillianist doctrine was condemned, and the bishop Instantius and Salvianus, with the laymen Elpidius and Priscillian, were excommunicated. This measure rendered the sect more resolute and determined; and Priscillian, that he might be more safe, was raised by the party from a layman to a bishop of Avila. The civil power was put in motion against the sect; and Idacius obtained from the emperor Gratian a decree, by which this sect, as well as others, was banished the country. This decree depressed them for a time. The leaders of the party took their course towards Rome; and while passing through France, they seduced many, especially in Aquitaine Gaul. Although they got no hearing at Rome, yet they found means to obtain a rescript from Gratian, by which the former decree was repealed, and these bishops were

Priscillian being slain, his opinions were not at once suppressed, but spread far and wide in Spain and Gaul: and even in the sixth century, the *Priscillianists* caused much trouble to the bishops of those provinces.

§ 22. The doctrines of the *Priscillianists* no one of the ancients has accurately described: on the contrary, some of them have perplexed and obscured the subject. It appears, however, from authentic records, that the *Priscillianists* came very near in their views to the *Manichæans*. For they denied the *reality* of Christ's birth and incarnation; maintained, that the visible universe was not the production of God, but of some demon or evil principle; preached up the existence of *Æons*, or *emanations* from God; declared human bodies to be prisons fabricated by the author of evil for celestial minds; condemned marriages, denied the body's resurrection, and the like. Their rules of life were very severe: for what many state concerning their flagitious and libidinous practices, rests on no credible testimony.

restored again to their offices. When Maximus had seized the government, he issued, at the instigation of Idacius, a command to the *Priscillianist* teachers to appear before the ecclesiastical council of Bourdeaux. Here Instantius, who readily and frankly answered the interrogatories of the council, was deposed; but *Priscillian* appealed to the emperor. Bishop Martin, of Tours, saw with concern a civil judge about to pass sentence in an ecclesiastical affair, and made representation on the subject to the emperor, who assured him that no blood should be shed. Yet the emperor was finally persuaded by some bishops to commit the investigation of the subject to his minister of state, Evodius, a stern judge. He, at Treves, in the year 385, put *Priscillian* to the rack, and extorted from him a confession that he had uttered impure principles, had held nocturnal meetings with base females, and prayed naked; and after the facts had been reported to the emperor, *Priscillian* and some of his adherents were put to death, and others were punished with banishment. This is the first instance of a criminal prosecution for heresy. The *Priscillianists* regarded these executions as a martyrdom; while their opposers sought in this bloody way to exterminate them; and the emperor had it in contemplation to send military officers into Spain, with full power to

search out the heretics, and deprive them of life and property. But here again bishop Martin showed himself in an amiable light. He repaired to Treves, and there made such representations as prevented the execution of the emperor's designs. Yet the people shed the blood of heretics in many places; and some bishops had such unchristian minds as to approve of it. Yet others, on the contrary, disapproved of it; and had great dissension with the former, in regard to it. The *Priscillianists*, however, still continued to be numerous in Spain, especially in Galicia; and in the fifth century, when the irruption of the barbarians into Spain threw the ecclesiastical affairs into great disorder, it afforded this sect opportunity again to spread itself very much. And in the sixth century, Aguirre has inserted in the *Council Hispan.* tom. ii. p. 269, &c. a letter of Montanus, bishop of Toledo, in the year 527, from which it appears that many persons of this sect then lived in Valencia; and in the year 561, a council was held against them at Braga. From this time onwards, no more is heard of them; and they must either have gradually wasted away, or have fallen at once on the irruption of the Saracens. See Dr. Welch, *Historie der Ketzerzei*, vol. iii. p. 337—430. *Schd.*]

That the Priscillianists used dissimulation, and eluded their enemies by deceiving them, is true; but that they regarded all kinds of lying and perjury as lawful, which is commonly reported, has not even the appearance of truth³.

§ 23. To these larger sects, certain minor ones may be added. One *Audeus*, an honest man, who had been ejected from the church in Syria for too freely reproving the corrupt lives of the clergy, collected a congregation and became its bishop. Being banished by the emperor into Scythia, he went among the Goths, and there propagated his sect with good success. As to the time when this sect arose, the ancients are not agreed. In some of their institutions they deviated from other Chris-

³ See Simon de Vries, *Diss. Critica de Priscillianistis*, Trajecti, 1745, 4to, in which the principal fault is, that he follows too closely Beausobre's *History of the Manichees*, taking every thing there asserted to be true. Fran. Girvesii *Historia Priscillianistarum Chronologica*, Rome, 1750, 8vo. In Angeli Calogerie *Opusculi Scientifici*, tom. xxvii. p. 61, occurs: *Bachärius illustratus, seu de Priscilliana heresi* Diss. which, however, is less occupied in illustrating the affairs of the Priscillianists than [the work of] Bachärius, [a learned Spaniard, who composed a short treatise de *Fals*, first published by Muratori, (*Anecdota Latinorum*, tom. ii.) and which some consider as a polemic tract against the Priscillianists. To these must be added Walch, *loc. cit.* p. 378—481.—To ascertain the real doctrines of the Priscillianists is very difficult, and, perhaps, impossible. The quotation from an epistle of Priscillian, which Orosius has preserved, (in his *Communitorium; inter Opp. Augustini*, tom. viii. p. 431.) is so obscure, that it would be very natural to suppose his contemporaries did not correctly understand him. Hence we cannot rely entirely on the testimony of the ancients, even if they appear to have been impartial writers. Still it appears unquestionable, that Priscillian embraced Gnostic and Manichean errors; that he misconstrued the Scriptures, and perverted them by allegorical interpretations; that he relied on apocryphal books as of divine authority; that he believed in the eternity of matter, and held that the evil angels were not creatures of God; that he also believed the world was not the work of God; and that all changes in the material universe

originated from the evil spirits. Concerning the soul, he taught that it is a particle of the divine nature, separated from the substance of God. The human body, as all other flesh, according to the Priscillianistic doctrine, came from the devil. And even the production of man, by the union of a soul with a body, was the work of evil spirits. They believed in an unconditional necessity for the changes a man undergoes, and which they ascribed to the influence of the stars. They denied the personal distinction of the three persons in the Godhead. It is very probable, that they controverted the *human* nature of Christ; and it is still more probable that they denied him a *real body*, than that they denied him a *human soul*. From these principles it would follow, that they did not believe in a resurrection of the body. The same principles led them to disapprove of marriage, and of the procreation of children; and to forbid the eating of flesh. Their moral principles were, in general, strict, and tended to produce an ascetic life. And on this account, the accusation of shameless debauchery, brought against them by their adversaries, is very improbable. Whether they all held prevarication, lying, and perjury, to be allowable, even in cases where one's religion is to be avowed, is uncertain. Yet it is very certain, that some of them held this dangerous principle; as, for instance, Dietrichus, from whose book Augustine quotes the arguments used to justify lying, which he also confutes, in his book de *Mendacio, ad Consol.* Yet that Priscillian and his first set of followers did not think so, appears from their suffering martyrdom. *Schl.*]

tians; among which peculiarities, this is especially noticed by the ancients, that contrary to the decree of the Nicene council, they celebrated the feast of Easter on the same day with the Jewish Passover. They are said, moreover, to have attributed to the Deity a human form; and to have held some other opinions little consonant with truth⁴.

§ 21. To this century, also, the Greeks and orientals refer the origin of the sect called *Messalians* and *Euchites*: and, indeed, clear traces of them first appear in the latter part of this century; though their principles were much more ancient, and were known before the Christian era, in Syria, Egypt, and other countries of the East. These persons, who lived secluded from intercourse with the world, in the manner of monks, derived their name from their habits of *prayer*. For they believed, that an evil demon naturally dwells in the mind of every man,

⁴ Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxx. p. 811. Augustine, *de Hæres.* cap. l. Theodoret, *Fabul. Hæret.* lib. iv. c. 9. Joach. Schröder, *Diss. de Audæanis*; which is in Joh. Voigt, *Bibliotheca Historiæ Hæresiol.* tom. i. pt. iii. p. 578. [and Dr. Welch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 300—321.—The founder of this sect is called both Audius and Audæus; and his followers are likewise called both Audiani and Audæani; and not unfrequently Anthropomorphites, because they were taxed with attributing to God a human form. Audius was of Mesopotamia; and stood in high estimation among the Syrians, on account of his holy life, and his great zeal for the honour of God. The last was so great, that he publicly punished his own brother, and would not flatter the avaricious and luxurious bishops; and for this he endured persecution, hatred, and reproach. But he was undismayed, and bore it all with patience. Yet when at last the hatred of his enemies went so far as often to beat him and his friends, he separated himself from the church (though, previously, some had refused him communion), formed a party, and got himself ordained its bishop. This step made the separation complete; for it was contrary to all ecclesiastical rules, which required at least *three* bishops to solemnize an ordination, and also forbade the ordination of any schismatical bishop. The orthodox bishops entered a complaint against him before the emperor, who banished him at an advanced

age into Scythia. This occasioned his going among the Goths, and converting many of that nation to Christianity. He erected monasteries among them, recommended the monastic life, ordained bishops, and died before the general persecution by Athanasius. Audæus held a few errors. He believed that God possessed not a perfect human *body*, but a human *shape*, and of course the form of human *limbs*; and that the fashion of the human body was copied from the divine shape, to which the scriptural term, *image of God*, is to be referred. In regard to their worship, his followers were strict *separatists*, and would not worship at all with those Christians who were of an irreligious life, or who held church communion with the irreligious. Nay, they discarded the name of *Christians* for that of Audians, because many of them had abused the name of *Christians*, in order to secure their safety. In regard to the feast of Easter, they were *Quartodecimarians*; that is, they kept this festival at the time the Jews did; and defended the practice, by appealing to the Apostolical Constitutions. They held apocryphal books, and had their own system of church discipline. In general, it may be said, they were rather *fanatics* than proper heretics. Their errors were proof rather of a weak head, than of a perverse heart; and their defence of their errors and contempt for other Christians, were the effects of their [religious or] fanatical pride. *Schell.*]

which can be expelled no otherwise than by continual prayers and hymns, but being once expelled, the soul will return to God pure, and be again united to the divine essence, from which it has been torn away. To this leading principle they added, as is clear enough, other strange notions, closely allied to the sentiments of the Manichæans, and derived from the same source from which the Manichæans derived their doctrines, namely, the oriental philosophy⁵. In short, the Euchites were a sort of *mystics*, who imagined, according to the oriental notion, that two souls resided in man, the one *good* and the other *evil*; and who laboured to expedite the return of the former to God, by contemplation and prayer. This sect

⁵ Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxx. p. 1067. Theodoret, *Hæret. Fabul.* lib. iv. c. 10. Timotheus Presbyter, de *Receptione Hæreticorum*, in Joh. Bapt. Cotelier's *Monumenta Eccles. Græca*, tom. iii. p. 403, &c. Ja. Tollius, *Insignia Itineris Italici*, p. 110, &c. Assemani, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. i. p. 128, tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 172, &c. and others: [in particular, Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii. p. 481—536. The names Messalians and Euchites signify *prayers* or *praying brethren*. The first is Syriac, [a participle, from the root ܥܚܝܬ *orait*,] and the latter is Greek [*Εὐχίται* or *Εὐχῆται*, from *εὐχῆ*, *oratio*. See Suicer, *Thesaur. Eccles.* tom. i. p. 1285, &c. and Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. c. ii. *Tr.*] They were so called, because they believed the essence of religion to consist in prayer, that is, in that tranquil state of mind in which a person neither thinks nor has volitions. They were also called *Enthusiasts*, because they pretended to be inspired, and to hold converse with the Holy Spirit; *Choreutæ* (*χορευταί*, *dancers*), from this motion of their bodies, which they commonly used; the *Spiritual* (*πνευματικοί*), which was the name they gave to themselves; also *Lampetians*, *Adelphians*, and *Marcanists*, from certain of their leaders. There were both pagan and Christian Messalians. The former acknowledged indeed a plurality of gods, yet they worshipped but one, whom they called *ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, the *Almighty*. These were more ancient than the Christians, built houses for worship similar to the Christian churches, and assembled morning and evening, with torches and candles, and employed their time in praising God;

whence they were called *Euphemites*. The Christian Messalians were so named from the coincidence of their practice with that of the pagans; they seem to be the offspring of monkish enthusiasm, and to have first appeared in Mesopotamia, and thence to have spread into Syria; but their origin cannot be traced with more particularity. They seem not to have been a party who had determinate, fixed principles of faith, peculiar to themselves. Their number also appears never to have been great. They were all ascetics, though they were not all monks, in the proper sense of the word. Their religious theory was founded on an impure mysticism, like what is common to nearly all fanatical persons and communities, and which originated, like the system of Maues, from the principles of the oriental philosophy. Yet the Messalians, like all enthusiasts, appear to have relied more upon spirits, apparitions, and revelations, than upon the oriental system of metaphysics. Their principles did not necessarily lead to vicious conduct, yet they might afford occasion for practising vice. And, in fact, there were among them many vicious persons, whom idleness and spiritual pride led into gross offences. And there were not wanting among them real villains, who abused the mystical stupidity of others, to subserve their own wicked purposes. Heretics, in the strict sense, they were not; although, led astray by their pernicious mysticisms, they embraced wrong fundamental principles in regard to practical and experimental religion; and actuated by these, they, at least in part, fell into heretical opinions. *Schell.*]

drew over many to its ranks by its outward show of piety: and the Greeks waged war with it through all the subsequent centuries. Yet it should be remembered, that the names *Messalians* and *Euchites* were used with great latitude among the Greeks and orientals, and were applied to all who endeavoured to raise the soul to God, by recalling it from all influence of the senses, though these persons often differed very materially in their religious opinions.

§ 25. Towards the close of this century, Arabia and the adjacent countries were disturbed by two opposite sects, the *Antidico-Marianites* and the *Collyridians*. The former contended, that the virgin *Mary* did not remain always a virgin; but that she had intercourse with her husband, *Joseph*, after the birth of our Saviour. The latter, whom females especially favoured, went to the opposite extreme: they worshipped *St. Mary* as a goddess, and thought that she ought to be honoured and appeased with libations, sacrifices, and offerings of *cakes*⁶. The more obscure and unimportant sects I pass without notice.

⁶ See Epiphanius, *Heres.* lxxviii. lxxix. p. 1033 and 1057. [*Κολυρίδες*, in Latin *collyridæ*. Tr. — Among the moderns, Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzerzeugen*, vol. iii. p. 577, &c. Dr. Walch makes mention (*loc. cit.* p. 598) of one Bonosus, concerning whom he also published a dissertation at Gottingen, 1754, *de Bonoso hæretico*. This Bonosus was, probably, bishop of Sardica in Illyrium, near the end of this century. He was accused of maintaining that *Mary* did not always remain a virgin, but bore several children. And this charge seems not to have been a false one. But whether Bonosus denied also the divinity of Christ, and taught that he was the Son of God only by adoption, is very dubious. Yet so much is certain, that in the fifth and sixth centuries there were opposers of the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the divinity of Christ, who in France and Spain were known by the name of Bonosians. But still, it is uncertain whether they derived the name from this, or from some other Bonosus. The reader may consult Ittig's *Supplémentum Operum Clementis Alexandrini*; where in the annexed *Fascic. Observat. Miscellan. ad Hist. Eccles.* p. 242, there is an Essay, *de Hæresi Bonosi*. The *Collyridians* (for Epiphanius makes them all females)

were women, who carried their respect for the mother of Jesus so high, that they were justly charged by the orthodox fathers with superstition and idolatry. They came from Thrace, and the yet more distant regions of Scythia, into Arabia. It was their practice to dress out a ear, or a square throne (*κερσίον*), spread over it a linen cloth, and on a clear day, once a year, place on it during the day a loaf of bread, or *cake* (*κολυρίδι*), which they offered to the virgin *Mary*. Dr. Mosheim (in his *Lectures*) considered them as a set of simple persons, who had considerable heathenism about them; and supposed this offering of a cake to be derived from paganism. While they were mere pagans, they were accustomed to bake and present to the goddess *Venus*, or *Astarte* (the moon), certain cakes which were called *collyrides*. And when they became Christians, they thought this honour might now be best shown to *Mary*. The doctor had in his eye, perhaps, a passage in *Jeremiah* (viii. 13), where the prophet speaks of such a sort of worship; and, in general, it is well known, that the offering of cakes in the pagan worship was a customary thing. See Dr. Walch, *loc. cit.* p. 625, &c.; and Tillenont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Eccles.* tom. xii. p. 83. Schl.]

CENTURY FIFTH.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. State of the Roman empire.—§ 2. Further decline of idolatry.—§ 3. Nations converted to Christianity.—§ 4. Conversion of the German nations.—§ 5. The Franks.—§ 6. The Irish.—§ 7. Causes of these conversions.

§ 1. To understand the causes of such things as were encountered by the Christians in this century, a portion of its civil history must be kept in view. We shall, therefore, first observe concisely, that the Roman empire, at the commencement of this century, was divided into two parts, one of which embraced the eastern, and the other the western provinces. *Arcadius*, the emperor of the East, resided at Constantinople. *Honorius*, whom the West obeyed, lived at Ravenna in Italy. The latter, commendable for nothing but mildness of disposition, neglected the affairs of the empire. Hence the Goths first laid waste Italy several times, and plundered Rome most miserably. This first great calamity of the Roman state in its western territories, was followed by many others of a heavier kind, under the succeeding emperors. For the ferocious and warlike people of Germany overran those fairest provinces of Europe, Italy, Gaul, and Spain, and set up new kingdoms in them. At last the Heruli, in the year 476, under *Odoacer*

their chief, having vanquished *Romulus Augustus*, who is commonly called *Augustulus*, overturned the empire of the West, and brought Italy under their subjection. Sixteen years after, *Theodoric*, king of the Ostrogoths, inhabiting Illyricum, invaded these unwelcome intruders, by the authority of the Greek emperor, and vanquished them; in consequence of which, the kingdom of the Ostrogoths was established in Italy, in the year 493, and continued with various fortune till the year 552¹. These new kings of the West kept up, indeed, an appearance of respect for the majesty of the emperors reigning at Constantinople, and chose to live seemingly under their fealty and protection; but in reality, they were quite independent, especially *Theodoric* in Italy, a man of distinguished abilities, and left nothing to the emperors but a certain shadow of supremacy².

§ 2. Amidst these wars, and the dreadful calamities that arose from them, the cause of Christianity suffered much. Yet the Christian emperors, especially those of the East, continued their efforts to extirpate what remained of the ancient idolatry. In particular, *Theodosius* the younger³ has left striking proofs of his zeal in this matter; for we have still extant various laws of his, requiring the idolatrous temples to be utterly destroyed, or to be dedicated to *Christ* and the saints, abrogating the pagan ceremonies and rites, and excluding the adherents to paganism from all public offices⁴. In the western parts alone efforts of this kind were somewhat less; and we therefore find the Saturnalia, the Lupercalia, the gladiatorial shows, and other idolatrous customs observed with impunity, both at Rome and in the provinces, and men of the highest rank and authority publicly professing the religion of their ancestors⁵. But by degrees this liberty was more cir-

¹ For a fuller account, see the Abbé de Bos, *Histoire Critique de la Monarchie Française*, tom. i. p. 558, &c.; and Jos. Ja. Maseov's *History of the Germans*, written in German. [Also Edw. Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. 29—31. 33—36. *Tr.*]

² Car. du Fresne, *Diss.* xxiii. ad *Histor. Ludovici I.* p. 280. Muratori, *Antiq. Ital.* tom. ii. p. 578. 832; and *Annal. Italie*: Giannone, *Histoire de Naples*, tom. i. p. 207. Joh. Cochlæi

Vita Theodorici Ostrogothorum regis, with the observations of Joh. Peringskiöld, Stockholm, 1699, 4to.

³ [A.D. 408—450. *Tr.*]

⁴ See *Codex Theodos.* tom. vi. p. 327. 331, &c.

⁵ See Macrobius, *Saturnalia*; in particular, lib. ii. p. 190. ed. Gronovii: Scipio Maffei, *delli Angitatri*, lib. i. p. 56, 57. Pierre le Bran, *Histoire Critique des Pratiques Superstitieuses*, tom. i. p. 237, and others; but especially Bernh. de Montfaucon, *Diss. de Mori-*

cumscripted, and spectacles too inconsistent with the sanctity of the Christian religion were every where suppressed⁶.

§ 3. The limits of the Christian church were extended, both in the East and in the West, among nations yet addicted to idolatry. In the East, the inhabitants of the two mountains, Libanus and Antilibanus, being miserably harassed by wild beasts, sought aid against them from the famous *Symeon Stylites*, of whom we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. *Symeon* told them that their only remedy was to forsake their ancient superstitions, and embrace Christianity. These mountaineers obeyed the counsel of the holy man; and having become Christians, they saw the wild beasts flee away, if writers tell the truth. The same *Symeon*, by his influence (for I doubt the existence of any miracle), caused some portion of the Arabians to adopt the Christian worship⁷. In the island of Crete a considerable number of Jews, finding that they had been basely imposed upon by one *Moses*, a Cretan, who pretended to be the Messiah, voluntarily embraced Christianity⁸.

bus tempore Theodosii M. et Arcadii ce Chrysostomi: which is found in Latin, in the *Opp. Chrysostomi*, tom. xi. and in French, in the *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscrip. et des Belles Lettres*, tom. xx. p. 197, &c. [The pagans traced the calamities of the empire to the prevalence of Christianity. Therefore, in the year 408, at the instigation of the Tuscan soothsayers, idolatrous sacrifices were again established at Rome, in order to procure success against Alarie: and the existing bishop, Innocentius, who was apprised of the measure, allowed it to take place, if we may believe Zosimus, on condition that the sacrifices should be offered without noise. See Zosimus, lib. v. cap. 41. To confute this accusation of the populace against Christianity, was the design of Augustine's twenty-two books *de Civitate Dei*, addressed to Marcellus. *Schl.*]

⁶ Near the close of the century, Anastasius in the East prohibited the combats with wild beasts, and the other shows. See Jos. Simon Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 268. 272.

⁷ Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana*, tom. i. p. 246, &c.

⁸ Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vii. c. 38.

[where the account, in brief, is, that in the time of Theodosius the younger, an impostor arose, called Moses Cretensis. He pretended to be a second Moses, sent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in Crete, and promised to divide the sea, and give them a safe passage through it. They assembled together, with their wives and children, and followed him to a promontory. He there commanded them to cast themselves into the sea. Many of them obeyed and perished in the waters, and many were taken up and saved by fishermen. Upon this, the deluded Jews would have torn the impostor to pieces; but he escaped them, and was seen no more. Likewise in the island of Minorca many persons abandoned Judaism. Yet their conversion does no great honour to the Christians; for it was in consequence of great violence done to the Jews, of levelling their synagogue with the ground, and raking away their sacred books. See the account of their conversion by the bishop of the Balearean islands: Severus, *Epist. Encycl. de Judæorum in hac insula Conversione et de Miraculis ibidem factis*; published from a MS. in the Vatican library, by Baronius, in his *Annales Eccles. A.D.* 418, and abridged

§ 4. The German nations, who rent in pieces the western Roman empire, were either Christians before that event, as the Goths and others, or they embraced Christianity after establishing their kingdoms, in order to reign more securely among the Christians. But at what time, and by whose instrumentality, the Vandals, the Suevi, the Alans, and some others, became Christians; is still uncertain, and is likely to remain so. As to the Burgundians, who dwelt along the Rhine, and thence passed into Gaul, it appears from *Socrates*⁹, that they voluntarily became Christians near the commencement of the century. Their motive to this step was the hope that *Christ*, or the God of the Romans, who they were informed was immensely powerful, would protect them from the incursions and the ravages of the Huns. They afterwards joined the Arian party, to which also the Vandals, Suevi, and Goths were addicted. All these warlike nations measured the excellence of a religion, by the military successes of its adherents, and esteemed *that* as the best religion, the professors of which were most victorious over their enemies. While, therefore, they saw the Romans possessing a greater empire than other nations, they viewed *Christ* their God as more worthy of homage than any other.

§ 5. It was this motive which produced the conversion of *Clovis*¹, or *Lewis*, king of the *Salli* (a tribe of the Franks), who conquered a large part of Gaul, and there founded the kingdom of the Franks, which he endeavoured to extend over all the Gallic provinces; a bold, cruel, barbarous, selfish, and haughty prince. For in the year 496, in a battle with the Alemanni

by Fleury, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, liv. xxiv. Yet it is certain, that the Jews even in that age often imposed on the Christians by pretending to have favourable views of Christianity. This appears from the *Codex Theodos.* lib. xvi. tit. 8. leg. 23; and *Socrates* (*Hist. Eccles.* l. viii. c. 17.) mentions a Jew, who received baptism, with a considerable sum of money, successively from the orthodox, from the Arians, and from the Macedonians, and finally applying to the Novatians for baptism, was detected by the miracle of the disappearance of the water from the font. Although this miracle may be doubted, and the impostor may have been detected by an artifice of the Novatian bishop, yet it appears from the story, that what is practised

by many Jews at the present day, is no new thing. *Schell.*

⁹ *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vii. c. 30. [They applied to a bishop in Gaul, who directed them to fast seven days, and baptized them on the eighth. Dr. Semler (in his *Hist. Eccles. Selecta Capita*, tom. i. p. 203.) supposes this event took place about the year 415. And in this year it was, according to the *Chronicon* of Prosper, that the Burgundians took possession of a part of Gaul on the Rhine with the consent of the Romans and their confederates, having promised to embrace Christianity. *Schell.*]

¹ [*Chlodoveus*, *Hadovicus*, *Ludovicus*. *Tr.*—The Teutonic origin of these Latin forms is *Hlothkeig*, which means *Booty-warrior*. *Ed.*]

at Tolbiacum², when his situation was almost desperate, he implored the aid of *Christ*, whom his wife *Clotildis*, a Christian, and daughter of the king of the Burgundians, had long recommended to him in vain; and he made a vow that he would worship *Christ* as his God, provided he obtained the victory. Having become victorious, he stood to his promise, and in the close of that year was baptized at Rheims³. Some thousands of Franks followed the example of their king. It has been supposed that, besides the exhortations of his wife, the expectation of an extension of his dominions contributed to induce him to renounce idolatry for Christianity; and it is certain that his profession of Christianity greatly assisted him in establishing and enlarging his kingdom. The miracles reported on this occasion are unworthy of credit; in particular, that greatest of them, the descent of a dove from heaven with a phial full of oil, at the baptism of *Clovis*, is either a fiction; or, as I think more probable, a *deception* craftily contrived for the occasion⁴. For such pious frauds were much resorted to in that age, both in Gaul and Spain, in order to captivate more readily the minds of the barbarous nations. It is said that the conversion of *Clovis* gave rise to the custom of addressing the

² [“Tolbiacum is thought to be the present Zulpick, which is about twelve miles from Cologne.” *Maccl.*]

³ See Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francor.* l. ii. c. 30, 31: Henry, Count de Barau, *Historia Imperii Romano-Germanici*, tom. i. p. 588, &c. Abbé de Bos, *Histoire Critique de la Monarchie Française*, tom. ii. p. 340, &c. [and J. G. Waleh, *Diss. de Clodoveo M. ex rationibus politicis Christiano*, Jena, 1751. *Schl.*—*Clovis*, once hearing a pathetic discourse on the sufferings of *Christ*, exclaimed: “Si ego ibidem cum Francis meis fuisset, injurias ejus vindicasset;” *Had I been there with my Franks, I would have avenged his wrongs.* See *Fredegarius*, *Epitom.* c. 21. *Aimoin*, l. i. c. 16; and *Chronicon S. Dionysii*, l. i. c. 20. *Tr.*]

⁴ Against this miracle of the phial, Joh. Jac. Chifflet composed his book, *de Anapulla Rheimsi*, Antw. 1651, fol. The reality of the miracle is defended, among many others, by the Abbé Vertot, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscript. et des Belles Lettres*, tom. iv. p. 350, &c. After considering all the circumstances,

I dare not call the fact in question. But I suppose that St. Remigius, in order to confirm the wavering mind of the barbarous and savage king, artfully contrived to have a dove let down from the roof of the church, bearing a phial of oil, at the time of the king's baptism. Similar miracles occur in the monuments of this age. [The possibility of the event is made conceivable in this way. Yet there still remain weighty historical objections to the reality of the fact. The story rests solely on the authority of *Hincmar*, a writer who lived 300 years after the time. *Avitus*, *Anastasius*, and even *Gregory of Tours*, and *Fredegarius*, are wholly silent on the subject. Besides, *Hincmar's* narrative contains the improbable circumstance, that the clergy who should have brought the oil that was wanting, could not get near the font, on account of the pressure of the crowd; but as anointing with oil was then practised at every person's baptism, it is improbable, that on so solemn an occasion as this, due preparation for this part of the service would have been neglected. *Schl.*]

French monarchs with the titles of *Most Christian Majesty*, and *Eldest Son of the Church*⁵: for the kings of the other barbarous nations which occupied the Roman provinces were still addicted to idolatry, or involved in the errors of Arianism.

§ 6. *Cælestine*, bishop of Rome, sent into Ireland to spread Christianity among the barbarians of that island, in the first place, *Palladius*, whose labours were not crowned with much success. After his death, *Cælestine* sent *Succathus*, a Scotchman, whose name he changed to *Patricius* [*Patrick*], into Ireland, in the year 432; a man of vigour, and, as appears from the event, not unfit for such an undertaking. He was far more successful in his attacks upon idolatry; and having converted many of the Irish to Christianity, he, in the year 472, established at *Armagh* the see of an archbishop of Ireland⁶.

⁵ See Gabr. Daniel's and the Abbé de Camp's *Diss. de Titulo Regis Christianissimi*; in the *Journal des Sçavans*, for the year 1720, p. 243. 404—448. 536. *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, tom. xx. p. 466, &c.

⁶ See the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Martii, p. 517, tom. iii. Februar. p. 131. 179, &c. Jac. Waræus, *Hibernia Sacra*, p. 1, &c. Dublin, 1717, fol. The same Ware published the *Opuscula Sti Patricii*, with notes, London, 1656, 8vo. The *synods* held by St. Patrick are given by David Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Brit. et Hiberniæ*, tom. i. p. 2, &c. [and thence republished in Harduin's *Collection*, tom. i. p. 1790, &c.] Concerning the famous cave, called the *Purgatory of St. Patrick*, see Peter le Bran, *Histoire Critique des Pratiques Superstitieuses*, tom. iv. p. 34, &c. [A full account of St. Patrick and his labours in Ireland, is given by archbishop Ussher, *Écclésiast. Britannicar. Primordia*, cap. xvii. p. 815, &c. *Tr.*—Rapin de Thoyras, in his *History of England*, (tom. i. b. ii.) remarks, that there were three *Patricii* or *Patricks*. 1. The *elder*, who died in the year 449, mentioned in the *Chronicle of Glastonbury*. 2. The *great*, who died in 493, after governing the Irish church for 60 years; he is the one mentioned by Mosheim. 3. The *younger*, who was a nephew of Patrick the Great, and survived his uncle some years. From his writings it appears, that St. Patrick was one of the most skillful men of the age in converting the heathen; yet that he used

unsuitable means to convert them,—namely, fear, threatenings, and fictitious wonders or prodigies. The Irish still show the cave, which is called *St. Patrick's Purgatory*, in which he shut up gross transgressors to be punished. Inclosed in the cavern (which is 16 1-2 feet long, two feet wide, and not high enough for a man to stand in erect, and situated on an island 126 yards long, by 44 broad, in lake Derg, county of Donegal. *Tr.*) the culprits were exposed to distressing terrors, and reported that they saw infernal spirits, and various terrific objects. The Englishmen who have visited the cave in modern times, could find nothing there to excite their fears. It appears, therefore, that the terror was produced by artifices. The cavern had certain holes, by which fire might be thrown into it. And the wild Irishmen, believing that the torments they were to endure there were inflicted by the devil, were put into so great fear that they dared not commit any gross offences. *Schl.*—There is no probability that Patrick had any thing to do with the cave that eventually became so famous. This, in fact, some say, did not attain celebrity until the 12th century. Lough Derg is upon the borders of Tyrone county, and contains some spots called *holy islands*, which are little else than bleak and barren rocks, and of which the one frequented by pilgrims, is called *Station island*. It comprises about half an acre, and has been, even of late years, crowded almost to suffocation, no fewer than 2000 persons having been

Hence *St. Patricius*, although there were some Christians in Ireland before his day, has been justly called the *Apostle of Ireland*, and the father of the Irish church, and is held in high veneration to this day.

§ 7. The causes which induced all these pagan nations to abandon the religion of their ancestors and profess Christianity, may be gathered from that which has been already said. He must lack discernment, who can deny that the labours, the perils, and the zeal of great and excellent men dispelled the clouds of darkness from the minds of many; and on the other hand, he must be shortsighted, and not well versed in the history of this age, who cannot see that the fear of the vengeance of man, the hope of temporal advantages and honours, and the desire of obtaining aid from Christians against their enemies, were prevalent motives with many to abandon their gods. How much influence *miracles* may have had, it is difficult to say. For though I can easily believe, that God was sometimes present with those pious and good men who endeavoured to instil the principles of true religion into the minds of barbarous nations⁷: it

there at one time. The majority of the pilgrims appear to be women. Sensible Romanists are, however, growing ashamed of the scenes on this spot, and in its vicinity. Hence these pilgrimages are on the decline. Patrick's connexion with Rome is at best perfectly uncertain; or, perhaps, rather, utterly improbable. Prosper, the chronicler, the friend, counsellor, and panegyrist of Pope Celestine, recommended him to send, in the year 431, a Roman bishop, named Palladius, to Ireland, which already contained some Christian societies. The experiment proved a total failure, Palladius being obliged to retire after a stay of not many weeks,—it has been said of not more than three. His mission, however, is commemorated in the chronicle of Prosper: not so that of Patrick, an omission so strange on the papal hypothesis, that Romish controversialists have been driven to contend that Prosper gives intelligible intimations of it, although he says nothing direct upon the subject. Such as have a bias against Romanism, and are, therefore, indisposed for mere inferences and assumptions in its favour, prefer that version of Patrick's history which he gives himself in his *Confession*,—an interesting document

admitted as genuine by the best critics, and first published by Sir James Ware, from an ancient MS. From this we learn that Patrick was born in Britain, educated in Gaul, and led into Ireland by an irresistible impulse to evangelize the country, having been first consecrated at home. During the remainder of his life, he was haunted by constant yearnings for visits both to his relatives in Britain, and to his early friends in Gaul; but a sense of duty detained him on the scene of his labours in Ireland. He appears never to have been in Italy at all, or to have been any way connected with the Roman bishop. Hence, probably, the silence of Prosper. That chronicler could commemorate the brief experiment of Palladius, abortive as it proved, because it had a papal origin: but Patrick seems never to have been thought of; probably because his mission, though successful, shed no lustre on the Roman see.—*The Case of the Church of Ireland*, stated in a *Letter to the Marquess Wellesley*, p. 70. Dublin, 1824. Hall's *Ireland*, iii. 272. *Ed.*]

⁷ [There is a remarkable passage concerning the miracles of this century, in the *Theophrastus, seu de Immortalitate Animæ*, of the acute Aeneas Gazæus,

is notwithstanding certain that the greatest part of the prodigies of this age labour under suspicions. In proportion to the simplicity and credulity that generally prevailed, was the boldness of crafty men in contriving impositions⁸: nor could the more discerning expose their cunning artifices with safety to their own lives and worldly comfort⁹. It is commonly the case, that when great danger attends the avowal of the truth, then the prudent keep silence, the multitude believes without inquiry, and the architects of imposition triumph.

CHAPTER II.

THE CALAMITIES OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The evils suffered by the Christians in the Roman empire.—§ 2. Attempts of the pagans against them.—§ 3. Their persecutions.—§ 4. In Persia.—§ 5. Individual enemies of Christianity.

§ 1. It has been already observed, that the Goths, the Heruli, the Franks, the Huns, the Vandals, and other fierce and warlike nations, who were for the most part pagans, had invaded and miserably rent asunder the Roman empire. During these commotions the Christians at first suffered extremely. These nations were, it is true, more anxious after plunder and dominion than for the propagation of the false religions of their ancestors, and therefore did not form any set purpose to exterminate Christianity; yet the worshippers of idols, who still existed every where scattered over the empire, neglected no means to inflame the barbarians with hatred against the Christians, hoping by their means to regain their former liberty. Their expectations were disappointed, for the greatest part of the barbarians soon

p. 78, ed. Barthii. Some of these miracles, he tells us, he himself had witnessed.—p. 80, 81.

⁸ The Benedictine monks speak out freely on this subject, in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 33. It is a fine saying of Livy, *Histor. lib.*

xxiv. c. 10, § 6: "Prodigia multa nuntiata sunt, quæ quo magis credebant simplices ac religiosi homines, eo plura nuntiabantur."

⁹ Sulpitius Severus, *Dial.* i. p. 438, ep. i. p. 457. *Dial.* iii. cap. ii. p. 487.

became Christians themselves; yet the followers of *Christ* had every where first to undergo great calamities.

§ 2. The friends of the old religion, in order to excite in the people the more hatred against the Christians, while the public calamities were daily increasing, renewed the obsolete complaint of their ancestors; That all things went on well before *Christ* came; that since he had been every where embraced, the neglected and repudiated gods had let in evils of every kind upon the world. This puny shaft was shivered by *Augustine*, in his *Books on the City of God*, a copious work, crowded with various erudition: at his suggestion, also, *Orosius* wrote his *Books of history*, to show that the same, nay, even greater, calamities and plagues had afflicted men, before the Christian religion was published to the world. In Gaul, the calamities of the times drove many to such madness, that they wholly excluded God from the government of the world, and denied his providence over human affairs. These were vigorously assailed by *Salvian*, in his *Books on the government of God*.

§ 3. But the persecutions of the Christians deserve to be more particularly noticed. In *Gaul* and the neighbouring provinces, the Goths and Vandals, who at first trampled under foot all the rights both of God and man, are reported to have laid violent hands on innumerable Christians. In *Britain*, when the Roman power was overthrown, the British race was most miserably harassed by its ferocious neighbours, the Picts and Scots. Wherefore, after various calamities, in the year 445, Vortigern was chosen for its king; and he, finding himself unequal to drive his enemy away, in the year 449, called the Anglo-Saxons from Germany to his aid. But these, having landed troops in Britain, produced far greater evils to the inhabitants than they endured before; for the Saxons became intent upon subduing the old inhabitants, and reducing the whole country under their own power. Hence arose a most sanguinary warfare between the Britons and the Saxons, which continued with various fortune during 130 years, till the Britons were compelled to yield to the Anglo-Saxons, and take refuge in *Batavia* and *Cambria*¹. During these conflicts, the condition

¹ [The modern Holland and Wales. Tr.—And in the farthest parts of the west of England, Cornwall, and contiguous districts of Devonshire. A

dialect of the ancient Cimbrie, or Welch language, lingered in Cornwall, among a few old people, till the eighteenth century. *Ed.*]

of the British church was deplorable; for the Anglo-Saxons, who worshipped exclusively the gods of their ancestors, almost wholly prostrated it, and butchered with extreme cruelty a great multitude of Christians².

§ 4. In *Persia* the Christians suffered grievously, in consequence of the rash zeal of *Abdas*, bishop of Suza, who demolished the *Pyræum*, or temple dedicated to *fire*. For, being commanded by the king, *Isdegerdes*, to rebuild it, he refused to comply; for which he was put to death, in the year 414, and the churches of the Christians were levelled to the ground. This conflict, however, seems to have been of short duration. Afterwards, *Vararanes*, the son of *Isdegerdes*, in the year 421, attacked the Christians with greater cruelty, being urged to it partly by the instigation of the Magi, and partly by his hatred of the Romans, with whom he was engaged in war. For as often as the Persians and Romans waged war with each other, the Christians resident in Persia were exposed to the rage of their monarchs, because they were suspected, and perhaps not without reason, to be favourably disposed towards the Romans, and to betray their country to them³. A vast number of Christians perished under various exquisite tortures during this persecution⁴. But their tranquillity was restored when peace returned between *Vararanes* and the Romans, in the year 427⁵. The Jews, also, who were opulent and in good credit in various parts of the East, harassed and oppressed the Christians every way that they could⁶. None of them was more troublesome and overbearing than *Gamaliel*, their patriarch, a man of extra-

² See Bede and Gildas, among the ancients; and among the moderns, Ja. Ussher, *Britannicar. Ecclesiæ. Antiquitates*, cap. xii. p. 415, &c., and Rapin de Thoyras, *History of England*, vol. i. b. ii. [The Saxons were not directly persecutors of the Christians, but only involved them in the common calamities of their slaughtered and oppressed countrymen. *Tr.*]

³ Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* l. v. c. 39. [where is a full account of the conduct of *Abdas*, and of the sufferings of the Christians during the persecution. *Tr.*] Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique*, article *Abdas*, vol. i. p. 10. Barbeyrac, *de la Morale des Pères*, p. 320. [An account of the manner in which Christianity obtained free toleration and an extensive spread in Persia at the commencement of this

century, through the influence of Maruthus, a bishop of Mesopotamia, who was twice an ambassador to the court of Persia, is given by Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vii. c. 8. *Tr.*]

⁴ Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. p. 182, 248. [See also Theodoret as above. The most distinguished sufferers in this persecution were *Abdas*, the bishop of Suza; *Hornisdas*, a Persian nobleman, and son of a provincial governor; *Benjamin*, a deacon; *James*, who apostatized, but repented; and *Severus*, who possessed a thousand slaves. *Tr.*]

⁵ Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vii. c. 20.

⁶ Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. v. c. 23, and 16; and *Codex Theodos.* tom. vi. p. 265, &c.

ordinary influence, and whom, therefore, *Theodosius Junior* restrained by a special edict, in the year 415⁷.

§ 5. So far as can be learned at this day, no one ventured to write books against Christianity and its adherents during the fifth century; unless, perhaps, the Histories of *Olympiodorus*⁸ and of *Zosimus*⁹ are to be considered of this character. Of these writers, the latter is every where mercilessly and unjustly sharp upon the Christians. Yet no one can entertain a doubt, that the philosophers and rhetoricians, who still kept up their schools in Greece, Syria, and Egypt, secretly endeavoured to corrupt the minds of the youth, and imbue them with at least some portion of the proscribed superstition¹. The history of those times has many traces of this clandestine machination, and so have the books of various Christians.

⁷ In the *Codex Theodos.* tom. vi. p. 262, &c.

⁸ Photius, *Biblioth. Cod.* lxxx. p. 178. [Olympiodorus was a native of Thebes in Egypt, a poet, historian, and an ambassador to the king of the Huns. He flourished about the year 425; and wrote *Historiarum Libri* xxii. addressed to Theodosius Junior, and containing the Roman history, particularly of the West, from A. D. 407 to 425. The work is lost, except the copious extracts preserved by Photius, *ubi supra.* Tr.]

⁹ [Zosimus was a public officer in the reign of Theodosius Junior, and wrote *Historiarum Libri* vi. in a neat Greek style. The first book gives a concise history of Roman affairs from Augustus to Diocletian; the following books are a full Roman history, down to A. D. 410. The best editions are by Cellarius, Jena, 1728, 8vo, and by Reitemier, Lips. 1784, 8vo. Tr.]

¹ Zacharias Mitylen. *de Opificio Dei*, p. 165, 200, ed. Barthii.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. State of learning among Christians.—§ 2. In the West.—§ 3. State of philosophy in the West.—§ 4. In the East.—§ 5. The younger Platonists.—§ 6. Aristotelian philosophy revived.

§ 1. ALTHOUGH the illiterate had access to every office both civil and ecclesiastical, yet most persons of any consideration were persuaded that the liberal arts and sciences were of great use to mankind. Hence there were flourishing public schools¹ in the larger cities, as Constantinople, Rome, Marseilles, Edessa, Nisibis², Carthage, Lyons, and Treves; and masters competent to teach youth were maintained at the expense of the emperors. Some of the bishops and monks, also, of this century, here and there, imparted to young men what learning they possessed³. Yet the infelicity of the times, the incursions of barbarous nations, and the penury of great geniuses, prevented either the church or the state from reaping such advantages from these efforts as were expected by those who favoured them.

§ 2. In the western provinces, especially in Gaul, there was no want of learned men, who might have served as patterns for

¹ [The history and progress of schools among Christians are the subject of an appropriate work by Geo. Gottl. Reufel, Hehnst. 1743, 8vo. *Schl.*]

are noticed by Valesius on Theodori Lectoris *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. p. 164. b. *Schl.*

² [The schools at Edessa and Nisibis ³ [On the episcopal and cloister schools in Africa, Spain, Italy, and Gaul,

others to follow. Such, among others, were *Macrobius*, *Salvian*, *Vincentius* of Lerins, *Ennodius*, *Sidonius Apollinaris*, *Claudianus Mamertus*, and *Dracontius*; writers, not indeed equal to the ancient Latin authors, but still not altogether provincial, and given up to the knowledge of antiquity, with other studies. The barbarians, however, who either ravaged or occupied the Roman territories, choked these relics of a better age. All these nations, in fact, considered glory and virtue of every kind as placed in arms and military courage. Hence they despised learning and all the arts. Wherever they settled, accordingly, there barbarism insensibly sprang up and flourished, and the pursuit of learning was abandoned exclusively to the priests and monks. And these, surrounded by bad examples, and living in the midst of wars and perils, gradually lost all relish for solid learning and praise, and substituted in place of it a sickly spectre, and an empty shadow of erudition. In their schools, the boys and youth were taught *the seven liberal arts*⁴; which being comprised in a few precepts, and those very dry and jejune, as appears from the treatises of *Augustine* upon them, were rather calculated to burden the memory than to strengthen the judgment and improve the intellectual powers. As the century, therefore, closed, learning was almost extinct; only a faint shadow of it remained.

§ 3. Those who thought it expedient to study philosophy,—and there were but few who thought so,—did not in this age commit themselves to the guidance of *Aristotle*. He was regarded as too austere a master, and one who carried men along a thorny path.⁵ Perhaps more would have relished him had they been able to read and understand him. But the system of *Plato* had for several ages been better known; and was thought not only less encumbered with difficulties, but also to harmonise better with religion. Besides, the principal works of *Plato* were then extant in the Latin translations of *Victorinus*⁶. Therefore, such among the Latins as had a taste for philosophical inquiries, contented themselves with the deci-

remarks are made by Ludov. Thomasi-nus, *de Disciplina Ecclesie*, tom. i. pt. ii. l. ii. p. 27, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ These comprised, I. the *Trivium*, namely, Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic; and II. the *Quadrivium*, or Arithmetic, Music, Geometry, and Astronomy. See

below, cent. xi. pt. ii. ch. i. § 5. *Tr.*]

⁵ Passages from ancient writers in proof are collected by Joh. Launoj, *de varia Aristotelis Fortuna in Academia Parisiensi*.

⁶ See *Augustine*, *Confessionum* lib. i. c. 2. § 1. *Opp.* tom. i. p. 105, 106.

sions of *Plato*; as will appear to any one who shall only read *Sidonius Apollinaris*⁷.

§ 4. The state of learning among the Greeks and the people of the East, both as respects elegant literature and the severer sciences, was a little better; so that among them may be found a larger number of writers, who exhibit some marks of genius and erudition. Those who prosecuted the science of jurisprudence, resorted much to *Berytus* in Phœnicia, where was a celebrated law school⁸, and to Alexandria⁹. The students in physic and chemistry resorted also to Alexandria. The teachers of eloquence, poetry, philosophy, and other branches of education, opened schools almost every where; and yet the teachers at Alexandria, Constantinople, and Edessa, were supposed to excel the others in learning and in the art of instructing¹.

§ 5. The sect of the younger Platonists sustained itself, and its philosophy, at Athens, at Alexandria, and in Syria, with no small share of its ancient dignity and reputation. *Olympiodorus*², *Hæro*³, and other men of high reputation, adorned the school of Alexandria. At Athens, *Plutarch*⁴, and his successor, *Syrianus*⁵, with *Theophrastus*, procured for themselves fame and distinction. From them *Proclus*, unquestionably the leading Platonic of this age, received instruction,—a man who gained for himself, and for the philosophy which he professed, so much celebrity among the Greeks, that he seems almost the second father of the system⁶. His disciples, *Marinus* of

⁷ See his *Epistles*, lib. iv. ep. iii. xi. and lib. iv. ep. ix. and others.

⁸ See Ja. Haseus, *Liber de Academia Jurconsultorum Berytensi*; and Zacharias Mitylen. de *Opificio Dei*, p. 164.

⁹ Zacharias Mitylen. de *Opificio Dei*, p. 179. [Among the moderns may be consulted J. Andr. Schmidt's Preface to Andr. Hyperius de *Schola Alexandrina Catechetica*, Helmst. 1704, 8vo. Hen. Dodwell, ad *fragmentum Philippi Siditi*, at the end of his *Dissert. on Irenæus*; Lud. Thomasinus, de *Discipl. Eccles.* tom. i. p. i. l. ii. c. 10. p. 210, &c. Joh. Geo. Michaelis, *Exercit. de Schola Alexandrina sic dictæ Catechetice origine, progressu, et præcipuis doctoribus*; in tom. *Symbolar. Litter. Brenens.* p. 195, &c. and Jos. Bingham, *Antiqq. Eccles.* lib. iii. c. 10. *Schl.*]

¹ Aencas Gazeus, in his *Theophrastus*, p. 6, 7, 16, &c. *passim*. Zacharias

Mitylen. *loc. cit.* p. 164, 179, 217; &c. and others.

² [See Note⁸ supra, p. 421. *Tr.*]

³ Marinus, de *Vita Procli*, c. 9. p. 19, ed. Fabricii. [Hæro was a preceptor of Proclus, and is the second of the three of his name, mentioned by Brucker in his *Historia Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 323. *Schl.*]

⁴ [This Plutarch, in distinction from the elder Plutarch, who was more of a historian than a philosopher, is denominated Plutarchus Nestorii, or Plutarch the son of Nestorius. See concerning him Brucker, *Historia Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 312, &c. Marinus, de *Vita Procli*, c. 12, p. 27, and Suidas, article *Plutarch. Nestorii*, p. 133. *Schl.*]

⁵ [Concerning Syrianus, see Brucker, *Historia Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 315. *Schl.*]

⁶ His life was written by Marinus,

Neapolis, *Ammonius*, the son of *Hermias*, *Isidorus*, *Damascius*, and others, followed eagerly in the footsteps of their instructor, and left many followers who copied their example. Yet the laws of the emperors, and the continual advances of Christianity, gradually diminished very much the fame and the influence of these philosophers⁷. As there was a sufficient number now among the Christians who cultivated and were able to teach this species of wisdom, so much confided in at that day, it naturally followed, that fewer persons than formerly frequented the schools of these heathen sages.

§ 6. But although the philosophy of *Plato* appeared to most persons more favourable to religion and better founded than that of *Aristotle*, yet the latter gradually emerged from its obscurity, and found its way into the hands of Christians. The Platonists themselves expounded some of the books of *Aristotle* in their schools, and particularly his *Dialectics*, which they recommended to such of their pupils as were fond of disputation. Their example was followed by those Christians who instructed youth in the precepts of philosophy. This was the first step made by the Stagirite towards that universal empire which he afterwards obtained. Another and a firmer was made in the Origenian, Arian, Eutychian, Nestorian, and Pelagian contests, which produced so much evil in the church during this century. That *Origen* was a Platonist, every body knew. When he fell, therefore, under public censure, many, that they might not be accounted his adherents, applied themselves to the study of *Aristotle*, between whom and *Origen* there had been little or no connexion. In the Nestorian, Arian, and Eutychian controversies, both sides fought with the most subtle divisions, distinctions, and quibbles. These were supplied by the philosophy of *Aristotle*, and not at all by that of *Plato*, who never trained men to disputation. The Pelagian doctrine has great affinity with the opinions of *Plato* concerning God and the human soul. Many, therefore, ceased to be Platonists as soon as they perceived this fact, and suffered their names to be enrolled among the Peripatetics.

and was published with learned notes by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Hamb. 1700, 4to. [See also Brucker, *Historia Crit. Philos.* tom. ii. p. 318, &c. *Schl.*]

⁷ See *Aeneas* Gazæus, in his *Theo-*

phrastus, p. 6, 7, 8, 13, ed. Barthii. [Among the moderns, Brucker, (*Historia Crit. Philosophiæ*, tom. ii. p. 337,) has treated of all these disciples of Proclus. *Schl.*]

CHAPTER II.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH, AND ITS TEACHERS.

§ 1, 2. The outward form of church government somewhat changed.—§ 3. The prerogatives of patriarchs.—§ 4. Evils arising from their authority.—§ 5. Contests between them.—§ 6. The power of the Roman pontiff.—§ 7. Vices of the clergy.—§ 8. Causes thereof. The saints.—§ 9. Monks.—§ 10. Teachers in the Greek church.—§ 11. In the Latin church.

§ 1. FROM the operation of several causes, the outward form of government in the church experienced some change. The power of the bishops, particularly of the higher orders, was sometimes augmented and sometimes diminished, according as times and circumstances altered; the will, however, of courts, and political considerations, had more influence in this matter than any principles of ecclesiastical law. These changes, however, were of minor importance. Of much more consequence was the great increase of honour and power acquired by the bishops of New Rome, or Constantinople, in opposition to the most strenuous efforts of the bishop of ancient Rome. In the preceding century, the council of Constantinople¹ had conferred on the bishop of New Rome the second rank among the primary prelates of Christendom, on account of the dignity and prerogatives of the city over which he presided. The Constantinopolitan bishops (with the consent, no doubt, of the court,) had likewise extended their jurisdiction over the provinces of Asia², Thracæ, and Pontus. In this century, with the consent of the emperors, they not only acquired the additional province of eastern Illyricum, but likewise a signal amplification of honour and privilege. For in the year 451, the council of Chalcedon, by its twenty-eighth *canon*, decreed that the bishop of New Rome ought to enjoy the same rights and distinctions as

¹ [A.D. 381. *Tr.*]

² [*Proconsular Asia. Tr.*]

the pontiff of ancient Rome, on account of the equal dignity and rank of the two cities³; and by a formal act, it confirmed his jurisdiction over the provinces in which he had gained a footing. *Leo* the Great, pontiff of old Rome, did, indeed, vehemently resist this decree, and so did other bishops; but in vain, for the Greek emperors sided with their own prelates⁴. After this council, accordingly, the Constantinopolitan prelate began to strive sharply with the Roman, and to oppress the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. In this contest, *Acacius* of Constantinople is said to have exceeded all bounds⁵.

§ 2. It was nearly at the same time that *Juvenal*, bishop of Jerusalem, or rather of *Eliá*, attempted to withdraw himself and his church from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Cæsarea, and laid claims to a place among the first prelates of the Christian world. His object was rendered more feasible by the dignity and estimation that Christians allowed to the church of Jerusalem, which they considered not only one of the apostolical churches, but which also seemed to have succeeded into the place of the primitive church of Jerusalem, and to be the mother of all churches. Therefore *Juvenal*, the emperor *Theodosius* Junior favouring his designs, not only assumed the rank of independent bishop of the three Palestines, or that of a *patriarch*, but likewise wrested Phœnicia and Arabia from the patriarchate of Antioch. And as this produced a controversy between him and *Maximus*, bishop of Antioch, the council of Chalcedon settled the dispute, by restoring Arabia and Phœnicia to the see of Antioch, and leaving *Juvenal* in possession of the three Palestines⁶, with the title and rank which he had assumed⁷. In this manner there were five principal bishops over the Christian world, created in this century, and distinguished from others by the title of

³ [Yet it appears, from the words of the canon, that the bishop of Constantinople, though made equal in power and authority with the bishop of Rome, was to yield to him a precedence in rank or honour; because New Rome took rank after her older sister, *ἐντέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάγειν*. Tr.]

⁴ Mich. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 30, &c. [See also C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Kirchensammlungen*, p. 310; and *Historie der Päpste*, p. 106. Schl.—and Arch. Bower, *Lives*

of the Popes, vol. ii. p. 64—84. ed. Lond. 1750, 4to. Tr.]

⁵ *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Crit.* tom. i. art. *Acacius*, p. 75, &c. [Dr. Mosheim here speaks incautiously; for in fact, *Acacius*, when all circumstances are considered, was to be justified. See below, ch. v. § 21. Schl.]

⁶ Concerning the three Palestines, see *Carolus a S. Paulo, Geographia Sacra*, p. 307, &c.

⁷ Mich. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. iii. p. 110, &c.

*patriarchs*⁸. The oriental writers ordinarily add a sixth; namely, the bishop of *Seleucia and Ctesiphon*, to whom, they say, the bishop of Antioch voluntarily ceded a part of his jurisdiction⁹. But they can bring no proof, except the Arabic decrees of the Nicene council, which are well known to have no authority.

§ 3. These *patriarchs* had great prerogatives. To them belonged the consecration of the bishops of their respective provinces. They annually convoked councils of their districts, to regulate and settle ecclesiastical affairs. If any great or difficult controversy arose, it was carried before the patriarch. The bishops accused of any offences were obliged to abide by his decision. And finally, to provide for the peace and good order of the remoter provinces of their patriarchates, they were allowed to place over them their legates or *vicars*¹. Other prerogatives of less moment are omitted. All the provinces, however, did not acknowledge the authority of the patriarchs; but some, both in the East and West, were exempt from their jurisdiction, and independent of exterior control². Moreover,

⁸ See the writers who have treated of the patriarchs, as enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibliograph. Antiquar.* cap. xiii. p. 453, &c. [See also Note², p. 314, &c. of this volume. *Tr.*]

⁹ Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticanæ*, tom. i. p. 9. 13, &c.

¹ David Blondell, *de la Primauté de l'Eglise*, cap. xxv. p. 332, &c. Theod. Ruinart, *de Pallio Archi-Episcopali*, p. 445, tom. ii. of the *Opp. posthuma* of Joh. Mabillon.

² Edw. Brerewood, *de Veteris Ecclesie Gubernatione Patriarchale*, a tract which is subjoined to Ja. Ussher's *Opuscula de Episcopis et Metropolitanorum Origine*, Lond. 1687, and Bremen, 1701, 8vo. p. 56—85. [The metropolitans and bishops who were subject to no patriarch were, by the Greeks, called *αὐτοκέφαλοι*. Of this description were the metropolitans of Bulgaria, Cyprus, Iberia, Armenia, and also of Britain, before the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons by the Romish monk Augustine. For the Britons had their arch-bishop of Caerleon, [upon Usk, in Monmouthshire, *Ed.*] (*Episcopus Caerleonis, super Osea*), who had seven bishops under him, but acknowledged no superintendence from the patriarch of Rome, and for a long time made opposition to him; and in Wales,

as well as in Scotland and Ireland, this independence continued many centuries. The church of Carthage was also, properly, subject to no other church; as appears from Leydecker's *Historia Eccles. Africane*, and from the writings of Capell and others, *de Appellationibus ex Africa ad sedem Romanam*. —Some common bishops, likewise, were subject to no metropolitan, but were under the immediate inspection of their patriarch. Thus the patriarch of Constantinople had 39 bishops in his diocese, who were subject immediately to him; and the Romish patriarch had in all his countries (*e. g.* in Germany, at Bamberg and Fulda,) bishops who were subject to no archbishop or primate, but dependent immediately on himself. — There were also certain bishops who were subject neither to any archbishop nor to a patriarch; as was the case with the bishop of Tomis in Scythia, according to Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* l. vi. c. 21. The churches in countries lying without the Roman empire, at first had no bishops dependent on the bishops within the empire; as *e. g.* the churches in Persia, Parthia, and among the Goths; and these did not come under the power of Romish patriarchs until they fell under the civil power of the Romans. Most

the emperors, who reserved to themselves a supreme power over the church, listened readily to the complaints of those who thought themselves injured; the councils also, in which the majesty and legislative power of the church resided, presented various obstacles to the arbitrary exercise of patriarchal power.

§ 4. The constitution of ecclesiastical government was so far from contributing to the peace and prosperity of the Christian church, that it was rather the source of very great evils, and produced boundless dissensions and animosities. In the first place, the *patriarchs*, who had power either to do much good or to cause much evil, encroached without reserve upon the rights and privileges of their bishops, and thus introduced gradually a kind of spiritual bondage; and that they might do this with more freedom, they made no resistance to the encroachments of the bishops on the ancient rights of the people. For the more the prerogatives and the honours of the bishops who were under their control were increased, the more was their own power enlarged. In the next place, they designedly excited dissensions and fomented controversies of bishops with one another, and with other ministers of religion, and also of the people with the clergy, so that they might have frequent occasions to exercise their authority, be much appealed to, and have a multitude of clients around them. Moreover, that the bishops might not be without intestine foes, nor themselves destitute of strenuous defenders of their authority, they drew over to their side the numerous tribes of monks, who were gradually acquiring wealth, and attached them to their interests by the most ample largesses. And these monks contributed much,—perhaps more than any other cause,—to subvert the ancient discipline of the church, to diminish the authority of the bishops, and to increase beyond all bounds the power of their patrons.

§ 5. To these evils must be added the rivalry and ambition of the *patriarchs* themselves, which gave birth to abominable crimes and the most destructive wars. The patriarch of Constantinople, in particular, elated with the favour and the proximity of the imperial court, on the one hand, subjected the

of the conversions of pagans, by missionaries from Rome, were in the western provinces of the empire. See Baumgar-

ten's *Erläuterung der christl. Alterthume*, p. 153, &c. Schl.]

patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch to a subordination to himself, as if they were prelates of a secondary rank; and on the other hand, boldly attacked the Roman pontiff, and despoiled him of some of his provinces. The two former, from their lack of power and from other causes, made indeed but feeble resistance, though they sometimes produced violent tumults and commotions; but the Roman pontiff, possessing much greater power and resources, fought with more obstinacy, and in his turn inflicted deadly wounds on him of Byzantium. Those who shall carefully examine the history of events among Christians from this period onward, will find that from these quarrels about precedence and the boundaries of their power, among men who pretended to be the fathers and guardians of the church, chiefly originated those direful dissensions which first split her eastern branch into various sects, and then severed it altogether from the western.

§ 6. No one of these ambitious prelates was more successful than the Roman. Whatever opposition might be made by his brother of Constantinople, various causes enabled him to augment his power in no small degree, although he had not yet laid claim to the dignity of supreme lawgiver and judge of the whole Christian church. In the East, the Alexandrian and Antiochian patriarchs, finding themselves unequal to contend with the Constantinopolitan, often applied to the Roman for aid against him³; and the same was done by the lesser bishops whenever they found the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch invading their rights. To all these the pontiff so extended his protection, as thereby to advance the supremacy of the Roman see. In the West, the indolence and diminished power of the emperors, left the bishop of the metropolis at full liberty to attempt whatever he pleased. And the conquests of the barbarians were so far from opposing obstacles to his growing domination, that they rather advanced it. For these kings, caring for nothing but the establishment of their thrones, when they saw the people guided by the bishops, and these dependent almost wholly on the Roman pontiff, deemed it good policy to secure his favour by bestowing on him privileges

³ [This is illustrated, among other examples, by the case of John Talaia, patriarch of Alexandria, who, being deposed, (A. D. 482,) applied to the Roman

bishop Simplicius for protection. See *Liberatus Diaconus, Breviar.* c. 18. *Schl.* —and Bower, *Lives of the Popes*, vol. ii. p. 189, &c. 194, ed. Lond. 1750. *Tr.*]

and honours. Among all those who governed the see of Rome in this century, no one strove more vigorously and successfully to advance its authority than *Leo*, who is commonly surnamed the *Great*. But neither he, nor the others, could overcome all obstacles to their ambition. This is evident, among other examples, from that of the Africans, whom no promises nor threats could induce to consent to have their causes and controversies carried by appeal before the Roman tribunal⁴.

§ 7. Of the vices of the whole clerical order, their luxury, their arrogance, their avarice, their voluptuous lives, we have as many witnesses as we have writers of integrity and gravity in this age, whose works have come down to us. The *bishops*; especially such as were distinguished for their rank and honours, employed various administrators to manage their affairs, and formed around themselves a kind of sacred court. The dignity of a *presbyter* was supposed to be so great, that *Martin* of Tours did not hesitate to say, at a public entertainment, that the emperor himself was inferior to one of that order⁵. The *deacons* were taxed with their pride and their vices, in many decrees of the councils⁶. These stains on the character of the clergy would have been deemed insufferable, had not most of the people been sunk in superstition and ignorance, and had not all estimated the rights and powers of Christian teachers

⁴ Lud. Ell. du Pin, *de Antiqua Eccles. Disciplinâ*, Diss. ii. p. 166, &c. Melch. Leydecker, *Hist. Eccles. Africane*, tom. ii. Diss. ii. p. 505, &c. [A concise view of the steps by which the bishops of Rome mounted to the summit of their grandeur, is thus given by J. Andr. Cramer, in his German translation of Bossuet's *Universal History*, vol. iv. p. 558, &c. as cited by Von Einem, in a note on this page of Mosheim. They were appointed by the emperors to decide causes in the western churches; they encouraged appeals to themselves; they assumed the care of all the churches, as if it were a part of their official duty; they appointed vicars in churches, over which they had no claims to jurisdiction; where they should have been only mediators, they assumed to be judges; they required accounts to be sent them of the affairs of foreign churches; they endeavoured to impose the rites and usages of their own church upon all others, as being of apostolic origin; they traced their own elevation

from the pre-eminence of St. Peter; they maintained that their fancied prerogatives belonged to them by a *divine right*; they threatened with excommunication from the church those who would not submit to their decrees; they set up and deposed metropolitans in provinces over which they never legally had jurisdiction; and each successive pope was careful, at least, not to lose any thing of the illegal usurpations of his predecessors, if he did not actually add to them. The truth of this representation is abundantly confirmed with the evidence of historical facts by various Protestant writers; and, among others, by Arch. Bower, in his *Lives of the Popes*, 7 vols. 4to, London, 1749, &c. Tr.]

⁵ Sulpitius Severus, *de Vita Martini*, cap. xx. p. 339, and Dial. ii. cap. vi. p. 457.

⁶ See Dav. Blondell, *Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris*, p. 140.

by those of the ancient priests, as well Hebrew, as Greek and Roman. Even the fierce and warlike tribes of Germans, who vanquished the Romans and divided the empire of the West among themselves, after they had embraced Christianity, could bear with the dominion and the vices of the bishops and the priests, because they had before been subject to the domination of priests; and they supposed the Christian priests and ministers of religion to possess the same rights that had been formerly conceded to the priests of their gods⁷.

§ 8. This corruption of those whose duty it was to inculcate holiness both by precept and example, will afford us less surprise when we consider, that a great multitude of persons was everywhere admitted indiscriminately, and without examination, into the sacred order; many of whom had no other object than to live in idleness. And among these great numbers were neither connected with particular places and congregations, nor had any regular employment, but roamed about at large, procuring a subsistence by imposing upon the credulity of others, and sometimes by dishonourable artifices. Whence, then, some will ask, those numerous *saints*, whom this age produced, as writers tell both of the east and of the west?

⁷ [That these pagan nations had been accustomed to treat their idolatrous priests with extraordinary reverence, is a fact well known. When they became Christians, they supposed they must show the same respect to the Christian priests. Of course they honoured their bishops and clergy, as they had before honoured their *Druids*; and this reverence disposed them to bear patiently with their vices. Every *Druid* was accounted a very great character, and was feared by every one; but the *Chief Druid* was actually worshipped. When these people became Christians, they supposed that the *bishop of Rome* was such a *Chief Druid*; and that he must be honoured accordingly. And this was one cause why the Roman pontiff obtained, in process of time, such an ascendancy in the western countries. The patriarch of Constantinople rose indeed to a great elevation; but he never attained the high rank and authority of the Roman patriarch. The reason was, that the people of the East had not the same ideas of the dignity of a *Chief Priest* as the people of the West had. The eastern clergy also practised *excommunication* as a punish-

ment of transgressors; but it never had such an influence in the East as it had in the West; and for this reason, that the effects of a pagan exclusion from religious privileges never were so great in the East as in the West. The effects in the latter are described by Julius Cæsar, *de Bello Gallico*, l. vi. c. 13, n. 6, &c. "Si quis aut *præcatus* aut *populus eorum* decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt. Hæc poena apud eos est *gracissima*. Quibus ita est interdictum, si numero impiorum ac sceleratorum habentur; ab iis omnes decedunt, auditum eorum sermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant: neque his potentibus jus redditur, neque honos ullus communicatur." *Schl.*—Another obvious reason of the greater importance attained by the Roman patriarch, was, the absence of the court. The emperor was an inhabitant of the new capital, the old afforded no resident capable of overshadowing its wealthy and influential bishop. The West also was far less civilized than the East, hence far more likely to supply its own centre of knowledge and refinement with applications for advice and interference. *Edl.*]

From the age's ignorance, whoever were of more than ordinary talent, and could write or speak better than men in general, whoever were endued with a certain dexterity in managing affairs of the graver kind, or with an uncommon degree of mastery over the mind and its emotions; these persons were viewed by those around them, not as men, but as gods; or to speak more correctly, as men divinely inspired and full of the Deity.

§ 9. The monks, who had formerly lived for themselves, and had not sought any rank among the clergy, gradually became a class distinct from the common laity, and acquired such privileges and opulence, that they could maintain an honourable rank among the pillars of the church*. The reputation of this class of persons for piety and sanctity was so great, that very often, when a bishop or a presbyter was to be elected, he was chosen from among them³; and the erection of edifices in which monks and nuns might conveniently serve God, was carried beyond all bounds¹. They did not, however, all observe the same way of life; but some followed the rules of *Augustine*, others those of *Basil*, others those of *Antony*, *Athanasius*, *Pachomius*, or some one else². Yet it must have been

* Epiphanius, *Exposit. Fidei*, Opp. tom. i. p. 1094. Joh. Mabillon, *Réponse aux Chanoines réguliers*, Opp. Posthum. tom. ii. p. 115.

³ Sulpitius-Severus, *de Vita Martini*, c. x. p. 320. Add *Dial.* i. c. xxi. p. 426.

¹ Sulpitius Severus, *Dial.* i. p. 419. Henry Noris, *Historia Pelagiana*, lib. ii. c. 3, in *Opp.* tom. i. p. 273. *Historie Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 35.

² [A monk was one who professed wholly to renounce this world, with all its cares and pleasures, and to make religion his sole business. The particular manner in which he proposed to employ himself was called his *rule*. The early monks, of the third century, were all Eremites or hermits; that is, they retired from all human society, and lived in solitude in the deserts and mountains. Such in particular were the Egyptian monks. In the fourth century they became so numerous in Egypt, as to turn their favourite desert into a populous country; and St. Antony, a leading man among them, induced great numbers to adopt his particular rule. St. Pachomius

about the same time organized the monks of Tabennesis into a kind of society; and henceforth most monks became associated hermits, having separate cells, but living under chiefs called abbots. Basil the Great improved on the plan of Pachomius, by erecting houses in different parts of the country, in which monks might live together in a kind of family state. He also made his monasteries schools for the cultivation of sacred learning: St. Athanasius, according to some, (see note 7, p. 354, above,) while resident in Italy, taught the people of that country how to form and regulate these associations of monks. And St. Augustine first established a kind of monastery in his native town in Africa; and afterwards, when bishop of Hippo, he, and some of his clergy, formed an association for religious purposes, which gave rise to the *regular Canons*, a species of clergy whose private life was that of monks. During the fifth century, the passion for monastic life was very great, and monks and nuns became extremely numerous in the West as well the East. Yet hitherto there had not been required of monks any vows of *perpetual* celibacy,

the fact, that they were all very negligent and remiss in the observance of their rules, the licentiousness of monks even in this age having become proverbial⁴; and these armies of lazy men, we are told, excited in various places dreadful seditions. From the enactments of councils of this century it clearly appears, that all monks of every sort were under the protection of the bishops in whose dioceses they lived; nor did the *patriarchs*, as yet, arrogate to themselves any jurisdiction over them⁴.

§ 10. Among the Greek and oriental writers of this century, the most distinguished, perhaps, was *Cyril*, bishop of Alexandria, very famous for his different controversies and writings. No impartial person will divest him of all praise; yet no good man will excuse his quarrelsome temper, his restless spirit, and his very great transgressions⁵. Next to him must be placed

poverty, and obedience, nor of adherence for ever to any one rule of life; but every one was free to continue a monk or not, and to pass from one society or class of monks to another at his option. Different monasteries had different rules, according to the wills of their founders or governors; but in all, the written rules, if they had any, were few and simple, the abbots possessing despotic power over their little kingdoms. The diversity which now prevailed among the monasteries as to their rules, is thus described by father Mabillon, (*Annals Benedictini*, lib. i. § 13, tom. i. p. 6, &c.) "As well in the East as in the West, there were almost as many different forms and rules, as there were different cells and monasteries, says Cassianus, *Institut.* l. ii. c. 1. In some, the pleasure of the abbot was the only rule; in others, the mode of life was regulated by custom and former usage; in most, however, there were written rules. And because all monastic rules, whether written or not, aimed at one and the same object, viz. to withdraw men from all worldly concerns, and from all worldly thoughts, so that they might be wholly devoted to God and religion; the monasteries were not, in general, so confined to any one rule, but that they could adopt or superinduce another at the discretion of the abbot; and this, without changing their profession, and without harm. Hence, in the same monastery, diverse written rules were observed at the same time, with such modifications as were necessary to adapt them to

particular times and places. And yet, amidst this great diversity of rules, there was the greatest harmony among all the monks, who constituted in reality but one society and one body, and were distinguished from each other by no peculiarities of dress. Removal also from one monastery to another, and mutual abode with each other, were easy and free; and not only where both monasteries were of Latins, but also where one was of Latins and the other of Greeks." *Tr.*]

³ Sulpitius Severus, *Dial.* i. cap. viii. p. 399, &c.

⁴ See Joh. Launoy, *Inquisitio in Chartam Inhumanitatis B. Germani*, in his *Opp.* tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 3, &c. 38, &c. In the ancient records, posterior to this century, the monks are often called (*clerici*) clergymen. See Joh. Mabillon, *Prefatio ad Sacul. II. Actor. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti*, p. xiv. And this is evidence, that they now began to be ranked among the *clergy*, or ministers of the church.

⁵ The works of Cyril were published by Joh. Aubertuz, at Paris, 1638, six vols. [in seven parts,] folio.—[St. Cyrillus was nephew to Theophilus, and his successor in the chair of Alexandria, from A. D. 412 to 444. Soon after his election, he persecuted the Novatians; assumed the direction of political affairs; quarrelled with Orestes, the governor of Egypt; and is said to have occasioned several insurrections and much bloodshed at Alexandria; to have

Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, an eloquent, copious, and learned writer, whose merits in every branch of theological learning are by no means contemptible, notwithstanding that he appears to have imbibed some part of the Nestorian doctrine^o. From *Isidore*

instigated the murder of Hypatia, an eminent female philosopher; and to have pulled down the Jews' synagogue, plundered it, and chased the Jews from the city. See Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vii. c. 7. 13, 14, 15, and Damascius, in Suidas, *Lex. voce* Ὑπατία. From the year 329, he was the most zealous and efficient opposer of Nestorius and his doctrines; wrote against him; condemned his doctrines in a synod at Alexandria, in his noted twelve Chapters; presided in the council of Ephesus, where Nestorius was condemned and deposed, A.D. 431. His zeal against Nestorius drew on himself deposition by some oriental bishops; but he was soon restored. With the bishop of Rome, he was always on the most friendly terms. He was certainly a man of talents, and his voluminous writings display much acuteness and learning, though the style is unpolished and not very clear. More than half of them are expositions of the Scriptures; viz. of the Pentateuch, Isaiah, the minor Prophets, and the Gospel of John. The others are polemic treatises against Arians, Nestorians, and others, who erred in respect to the Trinity and the person of Christ; ten books against Julian; about fifty Sermons; and near sixty Letters. See his life in Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xviii. p. 313—354. *Tr.*]

^o For a fine edition of the whole works of Theodoret, we are indebted to the Jesuit, Jac. Sirmoud, who edited them at Paris, 1642, in four volumes, folio. The Jesuit, Jo. Garnier, afterwards added a *fifth* volume, Paris, 1635, folio. [Theodoret, or Theodorit, was born at Antioch, about the year 336, of wealthy and pious parents. He was their only child, and, like Samuel, the son of their vows; and, therefore, named Theodoretus, *given of God*. When not quite seven years old, he was placed in a neighbouring monastery for education, where he had for associates Nestorius and John, who became the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch; and for instructors, Theodorus, bishop of Mopuestia, and Chrysostom, from whom he learned eloquence and sacred literature. He became early pious, was made first

lector, and then deacon, in the church of Antioch; and in the year 420, was ordained bishop of Cyrus, a considerable city in Syria, near the Euphrates, where he is said to have had the charge of 800 churches. The country was overrun with anti-trinitarian sectarians and with Marcionites; of whom he nearly purged his diocese, having, as he says, baptized no less than 10,000 Marcionites. In the year 429, his early friend Nestorius broached his errors respecting the person of Christ, and was condemned by Cyril of Alexandria. Theodoret espoused the cause of his friend, which involved him in a quarrel with Cyril as long as they lived. He was one of those who, in the year 431, deposed Cyril at Ephesus; for which he was sent home in disgrace by the emperor, Theodosius Junior. Cyril died in 444; and Theodoret expressed his joy at the event, which so enraged the emperor, that he confined him to his house. In 439 he was deposed in the second synod of Ephesus, and applied to the bishop of Rome, who now espoused his cause. Theodosius died in 450, and his successor restored Theodoret to his see, and afterwards summoned him to be a member of the council of Chalcedon in 451, where he professed his orthodoxy, and was reluctantly brought to condemn Nestorius. After this, returning to his diocese, he devoted most of his episcopal duties on Hypatius, and devoted himself to writing books, till the year 457, when he died, aged about 71. He was frank, open-hearted, ingenious, had elevated views and feelings, was resolute and unbending, yet generous, sympathetic, and ardently pious. His learning was great, his genius good, and his productions among the best of that age. The first and second volumes of his works embrace his Commentaries on the greater part of the Old Testament. Volume third contains Comments on all the Epistles of Paul; *Historia Ecclesiastica*, in five books (a continuation of Eusebius, from A.D. 320 to A.D. 427, written in a style elevated, clear, and well adapted to history); *Philothicus*, or *Historia Religiosa* (eulogies of thirty distinguish-

of *Pelusium* we have⁷ epistles, which display more piety, ingenuity, erudition, and judgment, than the large volumes of some others⁸. *Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria, has left us very little in writing; but has perpetuated his name, by his opposition to *Origen* and to his followers⁹. *Palladius*, on account of his

ed monks); and 146 Epistles. Volume fourth contains four books or dialogues, entitled *Erastus*, or *Polymorphus* (polemic, on the person of Christ); *Haereticarum Fabularum libri v.* (an account of the ancient Heresies); *de Providentia Orationes x. adversus Gentes*, or *Græcarum affectionum curatio*, (an apology for Christianity,) in twelve books; and some other small pieces. The fifth volume contains some other expository pieces, several sermons, thirty-four epistles, and seven dialogues against the Arians, Macedonians, and Apollinarists. All his works, Greek and Latin, with notes, were republished by J. L. Schulze, Halle, 1768—74, in five volumes, in nine, 8vo. See his life, in Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xviii. p. 355—432. *Tr.*]

⁷ [Numerous short epistles. *Tr.*]

⁸ The best edition of these letters, is that of the Jesuit, Andr. Schott, Paris, 1638, fol. [Isidorus was probably a native of Alexandria, but he spent his life in a monastery near Pelusium, now Damietta, on one of the mouths of the Nile; and hence his surname of Pelusiota. He flourished about a.d. 412, but was active and conspicuous from the year 388 to 431. As a monk, he was very austere in his mode of living; and retiring from the noise and bustle of the world, he devoted himself to reading and expounding the Scriptures, and to the practice and the promotion of piety and virtue. He chose the epistolary form of writing; and has left us 2013 short letters, which are divided into five books. In most of them a question is proposed, and answered by the exposition of a text of Scripture. The object is to expound the Scriptures, and to inculcate the doctrines and duties of religion. He was an admirer of Chrysostom, and, of course, had difficulty with Theophilus and Cyril, the patriarchs of Alexandria. But he feared no man whenever he thought duty called him to defend truth, or to censure vice. *Tr.*]

⁹ See Euseb. Remaudot, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 103. [Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria from the

year 385 to the year 412, was a man of a strong, active, courageous mind; but crafty, unscrupulous, selfish, and ambitious. He probably spent some of his early years among the monks of Nitria. Afterwards he became a presbyter of Alexandria, wrote a Paschal Cycle in 380, and was made bishop in 385. In the year 388, when Theodosius senior waged war in Italy upon Maximus the usurper, Theophilus sent his legate, Isidorus, to Rome, with letters and presents for both emperors, but with instructions to await the issue of the battle, and then to present only the letter and presents directed to the victor. (Sozomen, *H. E.* viii. 2.) In the year 391, he solicited and obtained of the emperor leave to persecute the pagans of Alexandria, and proceeded to demolish their temples, and seize whatever was valuable in them. Insurrections, and bloodshed, and the flight of the philosophers from Egypt, were the consequence. (Socrates, *H. E.* v. c. 16.) The major part of the ignorant monks of Nitria had so gross ideas of the supreme Being, as to suppose that he literally had eyes and feet and hands; and were therefore called Anthropomorphites. But the better informed monks held, that these expressions were to be taken metaphorically, as Origen had always interpreted them. And thus this controversy resolved itself into a contest respecting Origen's correctness as a theologian. At first Theophilus favoured the Origenists; but the Anthropomorphites came upon him tumultuously, about the year 399, and compelled him to change sides. From this time he was a zealous persecutor of all Origenists, (notwithstanding he continued to read and admire his works,) and actually made a bloody crusade against those Nitric monks who opposed the Anthropomorphites, drove them from Egypt, and followed them with persecution; and also all who befriended them, and in particular Chrysostom, whom he deposed in the year 403. See 'Socrates, *H. E.* vi. 7—17. Sozomen, viii. 11—19. His works are not numerous, and have

Lausiaca History, and his *Life of Chrysostom*, deserves a place among the better and more useful writers¹. Notwithstanding *Theodore* of Mopsuestia was accused, after his death, of the grossest errors, yet every one who has examined the extracts from his writings by *Photius*, will regret that his works are either entirely lost, or exist only in Syriac among the Nestorians². *Nilus* composed many works calculated to excite religious emotions, but more commendable for the writer's good intentions than for careful execution³. Our designed brevity obliges

never been collected and published by themselves. They consist of three Paschal Letters, or Episcopal Charges; several Letters; and considerable extracts from different polemic treatises. *Tr.*]

¹ [Palladius was born in Galatia, in the year 368. In his twentieth year he went to Egypt, and spent several years among different tribes of monks. The failure of his health obliged him to return from the wilderness to Alexandria, and thence to Palestine. In the year 400, Chrysostom made him bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia; which he exchanged, some years after, for Aspona in Galatia. The time of his death is unknown, but it is supposed to have been before A.D. 431. Palladius was a man of moderate talents and erudition, but pious, a devoted monk, and a perspicuous, unassuming writer. His works are: I. *Historia Lausiaca*, seu de SS. Patrum Vitis, *vel Lausum cubiculi Praefectum*, (Biography of thirty of the most famous monks;) written about the year 421; edited, Greek and Latin, by Fronton le Due, in his *Auctarium Biblioth. Patr.* tom. ii. p. 893—1053, Paris, 1624, fol. Some additions were afterwards published by Cotelier, *Monument. Eccl. Gr.* tom. iii. Several Latin translations are extant, often published. II. *Dialogus de Vita S. Joann. Chrysostomi, inter Palladium Episc. Helenopolitanum et Theodorum*, (Life or Eulogy of John Chrysostom,) first published, Greek and Latin, by Emeri Bigot, Paris, 1680, and again 1738, 4to, with some other works. Whether the Palladius who wrote this was the same as the author of the *Lausiaca History*, has been questioned. III. *De Gentibus Indiae, et Brachmannis Liber*, is extant under his name; but it is not supposed to be genuine. *Tr.*]

² See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vaticana*, tom. iii.

p. ii. p. 227, [and *ibid.* pt. i. p. 3—362, where we have Ebed-Jesu's catalogue of his works. Theodorus was born and educated at Antioch, where he was some time a presbyter, and where he and Chrysostom instructed youth in a monastery, and had for pupils Theodoret, the famous Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, and John, patriarch of Antioch. In the year 392, he was made bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, where he spent thirty-six years, with great reputation as a preacher, a bishop, and especially as an author. After his death, which happened in the year 428, he was accused of Nestorian, and likewise of Pelagian, sentiments; and was condemned as a heretic, in the fifth general council at Constantinople, A.D. 553. His writings were very numerous, embracing literal expositions of nearly the whole Bible; elaborate polemic works against the Arians, Eunomians, Apollinarists, &c., with many Sermons and Epistles, and a Liturgy. A Latin translation of the last is in Renaudot, *Liturgiar. Oriental. Collectio*, tom. ii. p. 616—625. His *Expositio Fidei* entire, with copious extracts from many of his other works, are extant in the Acts of the fifth general council, apud Harduin, tom. iii. in the works of Marius Mercator, and of other Fathers, and in the *Catena Patrum*, especially the *Catena in Octateuchum*; Lips. 1772, 2 vols. fol.; and in Münter's *Fragmenta Patr. Gr.* Fascic. i. p. 79, &c. Copenhagen. 1788, 8vo. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xv. p. 176—218; and Lardner, *Credibility*, &c., vol. ix. p. 389, &c. *Tr.*]

³ [Nilus was born of a noble family, at Constantinople, where he became prefect of the city. Under the preaching of Chrysostom he became pious, renounced the world, separated from his wife, and taking one of his two sons with him, retired among the

us to pass over what might be worthy of notice in *Basil* of Seleucia⁴, *Theodotus* of Ancyra⁵, *Gelasius* of Cyzicus⁶, and others⁷.

monks of Egypt, where he spent the remainder of his days. By robbers he lost all his property, and had his son captured; but he recovered his son. He was made a presbyter, and probably lived till near the middle of this century. His numerous writings have been read with pleasure by the lovers of monastic piety. His 355 Epistles were published, Greek and Latin, by Leo Allatius, Rome, 1668, fol.; and his *Opuscula*, (twenty-one treatises on moral and ascetic subjects,) Greek and Latin, by Jos. Maria Suarez, Rome, 1673, fol. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Basil was bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, before the year 443, and continued so till after the year 453. He possessed some talents; but he was an unstable man. In the council of Constantinople, A.D. 448, he voted with the orthodox, and condemned Eutyches. The next year, in the council of Ephesus, he openly sided with the Eutychians, and anathematized the orthodox. And two years after, in the council of Chalcedon, he appeared again on the orthodox side, and said he had been compelled to act with the Eutychians; but he had much difficulty to persuade the orthodox of his sincerity, and to allow him his episcopal office.—His works were published, Greek and Latin, subjoined to those of Gregory Thaumaturgus and Macarius, the monk, Paris, 1622, fol. They consist of forty-three Orations; of which seventeen are on the Old Testament, and twenty-six on the New; written in a lofty style, and tolerably perspicuous, but excessively flowery. The *Demonstration* that Christ has come, against the Jews, founded on the seventy weeks of Daniel, and the two books on the *Life of St. Thecla*, the virgin and martyr, though printed among his works, are supposed by many to be not genuine. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, flourished about the year 430. Little is known of him, except that he acted a conspicuous part in the council of Ephesus, which condemned Nestorius, in the year 431. Three Orations, which he then delivered at Ephesus, (two on Christmas-day, and one against Nestorius,) are extant, Greek and Latin,

among the Acts of that council, tom. iii. p. 983, 1003, 1024. Another of his orations was published with the works of Amphiloehius, Paris, 1644. His *Deposition of the Nicene Creed*, or *Confutation of Nestorius*, was published, Greek and Latin, by Combefis, Paris, 1675, 4mo. Theodotus, in the close of the last-mentioned work, refers to his three books on the *Holy Spirit*, which are lost; as are his seven books against Nestorius, addressed to Lausus. He has been accounted a good polemic writer. *Tr.*]

⁶ [Gelasius Cyzicenus was a native of Cyzicus, an island in the Propontis, where his father was a presbyter. He flourished about A.D. 476, and was bishop of Caesarea in Palestine. He is known chiefly by his *History of the Nicene Council*, or, as the Greek MSS. style it, his *Ecclesiastical History*, in three books. The first book contains the affairs of Constantine, till the death of Licinius in 324. The second contains subsequent events, the calling of the council, and the transactions in it, and during it, especially the disputes of the philosophers and Arians with the Nicene fathers. The third book, which is now lost, contained the subsequent life and deeds of Constantine. As for the sources from which he drew his information, he tells us, that when a boy at Cyzicus, he met with an old MS. history of the Nicene council, written by one Dalmatius, a former bishop of Cyzicus; that he then made large extracts from it; and many years after, composed his history from these extracts and from the writings of Eusebius, Rufinus, &c. This work of Gelasius, once in high repute, is now little esteemed; in particular, the account of the disputes of the philosophers and Arians, which constitute the greater part of the second book, are considered very questionable. The two surviving books were published, Greek and Latin, by R. Balf. Scot, Paris, 1599, 8vo; and in the *Collections of Councils*, by Harduin, tom. i. *Tr.*]

⁷ [The Greek and oriental writers, passed by in silence by Dr. Mosheim, are very numerous. As some knowledge of them is useful, and indeed necessary, for a theologian, a tolerably

§ 11. Among the Latin writers, the first place is due to the

complete catalogue of them, extracted from Cave's *Historia Litteraria*, is here subjoined.

Asterius, bishop of Amasea in Pontus; flourished about A.D. 401; an eloquent and popular preacher. More than twenty of his Homilies are published by Combefis and Cotelier.

Marcus, a monk of Nitria, Egypt; flourished A.D. 401. Seven tracts on practical piety, written with great simplicity, are extant in Fronto Ducaeus, *Auctor. Biblioth. Patr.* tom. i.

Victor of Antioch, a contemporary of Chrysostom; wrote a Commentary on Mark's Gospel; extant, Latin, in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. iv. p. 370.

Severianus, bishop of Gabala in Syria; flourished A.D. 401; a turgid writer, but a popular preacher. Twelve of his orations are extant, among the works of Chrysostom.

Heracleides, a monk of Constantinople; flourished A.D. 402. He wrote *Paradises*, or Lives of the Monks; much of which is copied into the Lausiac History of Palladius, and the remainder was published by Cotelier, *Monument. Eccl. Gr.* tom. iii.

Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 406—427; an enemy of Chrysostom, but famed for learning, address, and piety. Two of his letters, and some fragments, are extant.

Polychronius, bishop of Apamea; flourished A.D. 410—427; was brother to Theodorus of Mopsuestia. His exposition of the Canticles, and fragments of his Commentary on Ezekiel and Daniel, are extant.

Nomus, a converted Pagan poet, of Egypt; flourished A.D. 410. His *Dionysiacs*, in forty-eight books, written before his conversion, have been often published; e. g. Hanover, 1605, 8vo. His poetic version of John's Gospel was published, Greek and Latin, by Heinsius, 1627, 8vo; and his *Collectio et Explicatio Historiarum*, by R. Montague, Eton, 1610, 4to. He was a scholar, but a turgid writer.

Synesius, a philosopher, statesman, poet, and after A.D. 410, bishop of Ptolemais, in Cyrene, Africa; a man of fine talents, and a devoted bishop, but more of a philosopher than theologian. Besides several treatises, philosophical, political, and historical, he has left us 155 Epistles, ten Hymns, and some

Sermons; all published, Greek and Latin, by Petavius, Paris, 1612 and 1633, fol.

Philip of Side in Pamphylia, a friend of Chrysostom, and candidate for the see of Constantinople in 427. He wrote a religious History, from the creation to his own times, in 36 books; a prolix and tedious work, of which only extracts remain.

Eudocia, a learned Athenian lady, born A.D. 401, converted to Christianity at 20, and soon after married to the emperor Theodosius II.; proclaimed empress in 432; divorced, for a slight cause, in 445; then retired to Jerusalem, and spent her life in works of charity and beneficence; and in composing *Centones Homerici*, poetic paraphrases of the Bible, and other religious poems. She died A.D. 459, aged 58.

Philostorgius, born in Cappadocia A.D. 368, well educated at Constantinople, a Eunomian or Semi-Arian in principle. He composed, about the year 425, an *Ecclesiastical History*, in twelve books, extending from the first rise of Arianism, to A.D. 425. The work itself is lost, but an epitome of it, by Photius, was edited by Valesius, among the Greek Ecclesiastical Historians. His work was partial to the Arians, and is therefore censured by Photius and others.

Sabinus, bishop of Heraclea in Thrace; flourished A.D. 425. He was of the sect of Macedonius; and published a collection of the acts of the councils, from A.D. 325 to 425. The work is lost, except some extracts, preserved by Socrates and others.

John, bishop of Antioch, A.D. 427—441. He at first supported his early friend Nestorius, but afterwards abandoned him and his sect. Six of his Epistles are extant, Gr. and Lat., in *Collect. Concilior.* tom. iii.; and fifteen more, Latin, in Lupus' Collection of Ephesine Epistles.

Nestorius, presbyter at Antioch, and bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 428—431. As a bishop, he was very zealous to suppress all the prevailing heresies; but he soon incurred the charge of heresy himself, by maintaining, that in the person of Christ, the two natures were not so united as to form but *one person*; and that it was improper to call Mary *Θεοτόκος*, the mother of God, though

Roman pontiff, *Leo I.* surnamed the *Great*: a man of eloquence

she might be called *Χριστοτόκος*, the *mother of Christ*. For this opinion he was condemned and deposed, in the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. Afterwards, the emperor confined him to a monastery near Antioch; and then banished him to the deserts of Egypt, where he wandered several years, suffered much, and at last died. He was a popular preacher, and an active bishop, but, according to Socrates, (*H. E.* viii. 32,) not a very profound man. Besides numerous extracts from various of his works, several entire Epistles and some Sermons are extant, in the Collections of councils, in Lupus' Ephesine Epistles, and in the works of Chrysostom, Mercator, &c.

Meletius, bishop of Mopsuestia, A.D. 428 and onwards; a staunch Nestorian, deposed and banished for this heresy. Eleven of his Epistles are in the Ephesine Collection.

Isaac, a converted Jew, flourished A.D. 430, author of a treatise *on the Trinity, and the incarnation of Christ*, in bad Greek; extant among the *Opuscula Veterum dogmatica*; published by Sirmond, Paris, 1630, 8vo.

Acacius, a monk, and bishop of Beroëa, from about 378 to 436. He was a man in high repute, and has left us three epistles.

Acacius, bishop of Melitene in Armenia; a staunch opposer of Nestorius in the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. A homily he delivered there, and an epistle, are extant, in the *Concil.* tom. iii. and in Lupus' Collection of Ephesine Epistles.

Dorotheus, bishop of Martianopolis in Mesia; a bold defender of Nestorius at Ephesus A.D. 431, and therefore deposed, and at last banished. Four of his Epistles are in the Ephesine Collection.

Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis in Syria; a defender of Nestorius at Ephesus A.D. 431, and therefore deposed and banished. He had twenty-three Epistles in the Ephesine Collection.

Maximianus, bishop of Anazarbium in Cilicia; a defender of Nestorius, at Ephesus A.D. 431, but afterwards renounced him. He has three Epistles in the Ephesine Collection.

Helladius, for sixty years abbot of a monastery near Antioch, and then bishop of Tarsus. While a bishop, he defended Nestorius in the council of Ephesus, and for some time after, but

at length renounced him. Six of his Epistles are in the Ephesine Collection.

Euthérius, archbishop of Tyanica; defended Nestorius in the council of Ephesus, though not a Nestorian in sentiment. He was deposed and banished. Five of his Epistles are extant in the Ephesine Collection; and seventeen of his Sermons, against various heresies, Gr. and Lat., among the works of Athanasius.

Paul, bishop of Emesa; a defender of Nestorius in the Ephesine council, but who afterwards retracted. He has left us a confession of his faith, two Homilies, and an Epistle.

Andreas, bishop of Samosata; a defender of Nestorius from the year 429 to 436, when he renounced him. He has eight Epistles in the Ephesine Collection.

Proclus, amanuensis to Chrysostom and to Atticus; and the bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 432—446. He was a very pious man, a good scholar, and a popular preacher. His works, consisting of twenty Sermons, and six Epistles, were published, Gr. and Lat., by Ricardi, Rome, 1630, 4to.

Ibas, from about A.D. 436, bishop of Edessa. He was accused of Nestorianism, and acquitted, in 448; but was accused again, and condemned, in 449, and restored in 451. The greater part of a valuable letter of his, containing a history of the Nestorian contests, is extant, Gr. and Lat., in the *Concilior.* tom. iv. p. 661.

Socrates, Scholasticus, a barrister at Constantinople; flourished A.D. 440. He composed a faithful *Ecclesiastical History*, from the accession of Constantine the Great, to A.D. 439, in seven books; which is edited by Valesius, among the Greek Ecclesiastical Historians.

Hermias Sozomenus, also a Constantinopolitan barrister and an author of an *Ecclesiastical History*, from A.D. 324 to A.D. 439, in nine books. He is a more vivacious writer than Socrates, but is deemed less judicious. Yet, writing after Socrates, he has supplied some of his deficiencies. The work was edited by Valesius, among the Greek Ecclesiastical Historians.

Ireneus, Count of the empire, and the emperor's commissioner at the council of Ephesus in 431. He favoured the Nestorians in that council, and

and genius, but immoderately laborious in extending the limits

defended their cause all his life, and, therefore, was excluded the court in 435; became bishop of Tyre in 444; was deposed by the emperor in 448; and then commenced writing a copious Memoir of the Ephesine council, and of ecclesiastical affairs in the East for about twenty years. The work is lost, except the old Latin translation of certain parts of it, which was published by Christian Lupus, Louvain, 1632, 4to, under the title of *Variorum Patrum Epistolæ ad Concilium Ephesinum pertinentes*.

Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 447—449. He has left us two Epistles and a Creed; extant in Baluze, *Nor. Collect. Concilior.*

Eutyches, the heretic, a presbyter of Constantinople. He so opposed Nestorianism, as to confound the *two natures*, as well as the *two persons* of Christ. This error he broached in the year 448. He was condemned the same year; appealed to a general council, and was again condemned in 451. A confession of his faith, with a few of his Letters, is extant.

Eusebius, first a civilian at Constantinople, and then bishop of Dorykeum in Phrygia. He was the public accuser of Nestorius, of Eutyches, and of Dioscorus; from the year 430 to 451. His Epistles and some other of his documents are extant.

Diadochus, bishop of Photice in Epirus; flourished A.D. 450. He has left us some treatises on practical religion; ed. Gr. at Florence, 1573; and Lat. in *Biblioth. Patrum*, tom. v.

Euthalius, a deacon in Egypt; flourished perhaps A.D. 458. He wrote an analytical Introduction to the books of the New Testament, published, Gr. and Lat. by Zacagnius, Rome, 1698, 4to.

Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 471—488; very ambitious and active for the aggrandisement of his see. He has left us only two Epistles.

Nestorianus, a Greek chronographer, who flourished about the year 474. He wrote *Lives of the Roman emperors*, to A.D. 474. The work was highly commended by John Malala; but it is lost.

Johannes Aegates, a Nestorian; flourished A.D. 483, or later; and wrote an Ecclesiastical History, in ten books; of which (says Photius), the first five

books reached from A.D. 428 to 479. Only some extracts of it remain.

Sabas, a Syrian monk and abbot, born in 439, died 531. He wrote a Typicon, or the order of prayer for the whole year; which was adopted in all the monasteries about Jerusalem, and is still extant.

Justin, a bishop in Sicily, A.D. 484; author of some Epistles, and (as Dodwell supposes,) of the *Questions ad Orthodoxos*, published among the works of Justin Martyr.

Aeneas Gazæus, a sophist and a Platonist, and then a Christian; flourished about A.D. 488. He was the author of a noted Dialogue, entitled *Theophrastus*, or, on the Immortality of Souls, and the Resurrection of the Body; ed. Gr. and Lat. by Barth. Lips. 1658, 4to.

Athanasius junior, or Celestes; bishop of Alexandria A.D. 490—497; a fine biblical scholar, an active and good bishop, and a devout man. He is supposed to be the author of several of the works ascribed to Athanasius the Great, and published as such: namely, 1. *Sacre Scripture Synopsis*; 2. *Questions et Responsiones ad Antiochum*; 3. the two tracts, *de Incarnatione Verbi Dei*; 4. *Synagoga Doctrinæ, ad Clericos et Laicos*; 5. *de Virginitate, sive Asceti*.

Zacharias, a rhetorician; flourished A.D. 491. He wrote an Ecclesiastical History, from A.D. 450—491; which is often quoted, as well as censured for partiality, by Evagrius, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

Eustathius, of Syria; flourished A.D. 496. He wrote *Chronicorum Compendium*, from Aeneas to Anastasius, or A.D. 496; in nine books, which are lost.

Malchus, a Byzantine sophist; flourished A.D. 496. He composed a Roman History, from Constantine the Great to the emperor Anastasius. Two large extracts only are extant.

Basil of Cilicia, first a presbyter at Antioch, and then bishop of Irenopolis in Cilicia; flourished A.D. 497. He wrote an Ecclesiastical History, in three books; extending from A.D. 450 to A.D. 527; also *Contra Johannem Scythopolitanum libri xvi.* accusing him of Manichæism. Neither work is extant.

Candidus, a scrivener to the governors of the province of Isauria; flourished A.D. 496. He wrote *Historiarum libri iii.* extending from A.D. 457 to A.D.

of his power⁸. *Orosius* is famous for his *history*, written to confute the cavils of the pagans, and for his books against the Pelagians and Priscillianists⁹. *Cassian*, an ignorant and superstitious man, by his discourse, institutions, and writings, instructed the Gauls in the mode of living pursued by the monks of Syria and Egypt, and was a leading teacher among those denominated Semi-Pelagians¹. The *Homilies* of *Maximus*

491. Some extracts by Photius are all that remain.

Andreas, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia; flourished about A.D. 500. He wrote a Commentary on the Apocalypse; which is extant, Gr. and Lat. inter *Opp.* Chrysostomi, tom. xii. ed. Morell.—also *Therapeutica Spirituális*; of which only some fragments remain. *Tr.*]

⁸ The entire works of Leo I. [comprising 100 Sermons, and 141 Epistles,] were edited with great care, by the celebrated presbyter of the Oratory, Pasch. Quesnel, Lyons, 1700, 2 vols. fol. [This edition being proscribed by the pope, because the editor defended the cause of Hilary of Arles, and the liberties of the Gallican church, against Leo; a new edition was published by Cacciari and the brothers Ballerini.—Leo was a man of extraordinary talents, a good writer, an indefatigable bishop, and very successful in promoting the glory of the see of Rome. It has been said, that he possessed every virtue that was compatible with an unbounded ambition. He was bishop of Rome from A.D. 440 to A.D. 461. In the beginning of his reign, he persecuted the sectarians of Africa, who took refuge in Italy on the conquest of Africa by the Vandals. In 445 commenced his controversy with Hilary, archbishop of Arles, whom he divested of his rights as a metropolitan, in violation of the liberties of the Gallican church. He also obtained from Valentinian III. a decree confirming his usurpations over the Gallic church. In 451, he showed the violence of his passions and the excess of his ambition, by his opposition to the decree of the council of Chalcedon, which raised the bishop of Constantinople to the rank of a patriarch, and extended very much his jurisdiction. In the year 455, he was a protection to the city of Rome, when it was pillaged by Genseric, king of the Vandals. See M. Schroeckh, *Kir-*

chengesch. vol. xvii. p. 90—169; and A. Bower, *Lives of the Popes*, vol. ii. p. 7—140. *Tr.*]

⁹ Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, tom. iii. voce *Oros.* The works of Orosius have at length been published, with some medals, by Sigb. Havercamp, Leyden, 1738, 4to.—[Paul Orosius was a presbyter of Tarragona in Spain. In the year 413, he was sent into Africa, to consult Augustine respecting the rising sect of the Priscillianists, Augustine now put him upon writing his history; which he completed four years afterwards. In the year 415, Augustine sent him to Palestine, to visit Jerome, and learn his opinion respecting the origin of souls. He was present at some councils in Palestine; and there opposed the errors of Pelagius. On his return to Africa, he brought with him the relics of St. Stephen, which were highly valued. He afterwards returned to Spain. The time of his death is unknown. His works, written in good Latin, comprise, 1. *Historiarum adversus Paganos libri vii.*; in which he endeavours to show from the Roman history, that as great calamities had happened in the empire under the reign of paganism, as under that of Christianity. 2. *Apologiens contra Pelagianos de arbitrii libertate*. These two works are in the edition of Havercamp. 3. His written statement to Augustine, in the year 413, which is published among the works of Augustine, and is entitled, *Commonitorium sive Consultatio ad S. Augustinum, de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum.* *Tr.*]

¹ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 215, &c. Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclésiastique*, par M. du Pin, tom. i. p. 156. The works of Cassian, with a prolix Commentary, were published by Alard. Gazæus; latest ed. Francf. 1722, fol.—[John Cassianus, of Scythian extract, was born at Athens A.D. 351. He early devoted himself to a monastic life; which he pursued first

of Turin, which are still extant, are short, but generally neat and pious². *Eucherius* of Lyons is not the last among the Latins of this century, who treated moral subjects eloquently and well³. *Pontius*⁴ of Nola, highly esteemed by the ancients for his piety, has recommended himself to posterity by his poems, and by some other things⁵. *Peter*, bishop of Ravenna, acquired the surname of *Chrysologus*, on account of his eloquence; and his discourses are not entirely destitute of genius⁶. *Salvian*, an

at Bethlehem, then at Nitria in Egypt, next at Constantinople, where Chrysostom made him deacon of a church. On the banishment of Chrysostom, A.D. 404, the clergy of Constantinople sent Cassianus to Italy, to solicit aid to their cause from the Roman pontiff. At Rome, Cassianus was ordained a presbyter; and there he remained till A.D. 410, when, on the capture of Rome by the Goths, he retired to Marseilles in France. Here he erected two monasteries, one for males and one for females; and thenceforth devoted himself to the furtherance of monkery in Gaul. He commenced author in 424, and died A.D. 448, aged 97 years. He was not a great man; but he was active, pious, and sincere. He was a leading man among the Semi-Pelagians; and held, perhaps, nearly the same sentiments respecting original sin, and grace, and human ability, with the Remonstrants or Arminians of Holland in the seventeenth century. His works are, 1. *de Institutis Cenobiorum libri* xii.; of which the first four books describe the form and regulations of a monastery; and the eight following treat of as many principal sins. 2. *XXIV. Collationes Patrum*; discourses, or rather Colloquies, chiefly on monastic virtues. 3. *De Christi Incarnatione adversus Nestorianum*, libri vii. *Tr.*

² [Maximus was bishop of Turin in Piedmont from A.D. 422 to A.D. 466. Little is known of his life. His works consist of eighty-five short Homilies or sermons. Of these, thirty-two were published among the works of Ambrose; and eight among the discourses of Augustine. Theoph. Raynaud collected and published seventy-three of them under the name of the real author, in a volume containing the works of Leo I. and of Peter Chrysologus; Lyons, 1652, and Paris, 1671, fol. Afterwards,

Maibillon collected twelve more; which he published in his *Museum Italicum*, tom. i. pt. ii. p. 1, &c. And Bruno Bruni published the whole, Rome, 1784, fol. *Tr.*]

³ Concerning Eucherius, the Benedictine monks treat largely, in *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 275. [He was of an honourable family in Gaul, fond of monkery in his youth, and resided some time in a monastery in the island Lerins. But he afterwards married, and had two sons, Salonius and Veranius, who became bishops. He was bishop of Lyons from A.D. 431 to A.D. 454. His most admired work is his Epistle to Valerianus, *On Contempt of the World and Secular Philosophy*. Besides this, he wrote in praise of monkery; instructions for his sons; and several Homilies. Several works are falsely ascribed to him. The whole were published, Basil, 1531, and Rome, 1564, 4to, and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. vi. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Paulinus. *Tr.*]

⁵ [See the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 179. The works of Paulinus were published by J. Bapt. le Brun, Paris, 1685, 2 vols. 4to. [See note⁴, p. 339, on the preceding century, where he is particularly described. *Tr.*]

⁶ See Agnelli, *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesie Ravennatensis*, tom. i. p. 321, ed. Bachinii. — [Peter Chrysologus was an Italian, of a noble family. He was born at Imola, and educated under the bishop of that see. In the year 433, he was made bishop of Ravenna, where he died about A.D. 450. He has left us 147 short Homilies or Sermons; and one Epistle, addressed to Eutyches the heretic, in the year 449. His works have been often published; the latest edition is, perhaps, that of Venice, 1742, fol. *Tr.*]

eloquent writer, but gloomy and austere, who, in the vehemence of his declamation against the vices of the times, unwarily discloses the weaknesses and defects of his own character⁷. *Prosper* of Aquitain⁸, and *Marius Mercator*⁹, can scarcely be unknown to any one who has paid some attention to the Pelagian and other controversies of this century. *Vincent* of Lerins has continued his name to posterity, by a short but elegant tract

⁷ See *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 517. [“The authors of the history here referred to, give a different account of Salvian’s character. They acknowledge that his declamation against the vices of the age, in his *Treatise against Aracrice*, and his *Discourse concerning Providence*, are warm and vehement; but they represent him notwithstanding as one of the most humane and benevolent men of his time.” *Mscl.*—Salvian was a native of Gaul, probably of Cologne; lived long at Treves, and married a pagan lady, who, however, became a Christian after marriage; had one child, a daughter. At length he removed to the south of France, and became a presbyter of Marseilles, where he lived to a great age. He flourished as early as 440; but was alive, though an old man, in the year 495. See *Gennadius*, (who was a contemporary presbyter of Marseilles,) *de Scriptoris Ecclesiasticis*, cap. 67. The works of Salvian now extant, are, 1. *On the Providence and Government of God, and his righteous temporal Judgments*, eight books. 2. *Nine Epistles*. 3. *Against Aracrice, especially in clergymen and bishops*, four books. His style is barbarous, yet vivid and energetic. His conceptions are clear, his reasoning pungent, and his sentiments for the most part correct. Yet his descriptions are coarse, and often too highly coloured, and his positions sometimes untenable. The works of Salvian have been often published. The best edition is that of Steph. Baluze, Paris, 1669, 8vo. *Tr.*]

⁸ For a good account of *Prosper*, see the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 369.—[*Tiro Prosper*, a layman, but a learned theologian, of Aquitain, in Gaul, flourished A.D. 441. He was a great admirer and an able defender of the doctrines of Augustine, respecting original sin, predestination, and free grace. In the year 426, he addressed a letter to Augustine, acquainting him with the incipient pro-

gress of Pelagian errors in Gaul, and soliciting him to write against them. In 431 he visited Italy, to procure the aid of the Roman pontiff against these errors; and returned strengthened by a doctrinal letter addressed to the bishops of Gaul. In 433, he wrote his strictures on the thirteenth *Collatio* of John Cassianus, which is an able performance. In 443, Leo I. called him to Rome, and made him his private secretary, and employed him in the Pelagian contests of Italy. He was alive in 455; but the time of his death is unknown. He was a man of strong reasoning powers, soundly orthodox, and a good model in controversial writing. Most of his works are in defence of the doctrines of original sin, predestination, and free grace; and especially his two books (if indeed they are his,) *de Vocatione Gentium*, (on the offer of salvation to all men,) will be read with interest by the modern theologian. He also composed a *Chronicon*, continuing that of Eusebius down to A.D. 455; a Commentary on the last fifty Psalms; several letters, and some poems. His works were published, Paris, 1711, fol. and by Salma, Rome, 1732, 8vo. *Tr.*]

⁹ [*Marius Mercator* was probably an African, yet may have lived sometime in Italy. He was undoubtedly a layman, a friend and admirer of Augustine, and an active defender of his doctrines from A.D. 418, to the year 451. His works are almost wholly translations from the Greek fathers, particularly Nestorius, Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Cyril of Alexandria, Proclus, Theodoret, &c. accompanied with prefaces and notes or strictures by the translator. They are all designed to confute either the Nestorian or the Pelagian errors; and were edited with copious notes by Joh. Garnier, Paris, 1673, fol., and still better by Steph. Baluze, Paris, 1684, 8vo. *Tr.*]

against the sects, which he entitled *Commonitorium*¹. I designedly pass over *Sidonius Apollinaris*, a tumid writer, though not destitute of eloquence²; *Vigilius* of Tapsus³; *Arnobius* Junior,

¹ A good account of Vincentius of Lerins is found in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 305. [He was born of a noble family at Toul, in the French Netherlands; became a soldier, and afterwards a monk at Lerins, where he was made a presbyter. He flourished A.D. 434, and died before the year 450. He was probably a Semi-Pelagian; as may be inferred from his *Objections against the writings and doctrines of Augustine*, which (though lost) are confuted by Prosper of Aquitaine. His only surviving work is his *Commonitorium adversus Hæreticos*. This he re-wrote, but lost the copy, and therefore added notes to the first draft. It is an attempt to confute all heresies at once, by showing what are the marks of the true church, as distinguished from all errorists. It has been often published; e.g. by Baluze, subjoined to Salvian's works, Paris, 1669, 8vo, and Cambridge, 1687, 12mo. Tr.—Vincent's *Commonitory* was re-published at Oxford in 1826, and an English translation of it, revised from one published in 1651, was printed there in the following year. It contains a famous test of Catholicity, to which Protestants have often appealed as conclusive against Romanism. *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est, hoc est vere propriæque Catholicæ, quod ipsa eis nominis rationeque declarat*. Protestants consider Romanists unable to fix their peculiar tenets among articles of the Catholic faith, from a failure of proof as to reception every where, always, and by all. Ed.]

² [C. Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius was born of a noble family at Lyons, in France, A.D. 431. His father and grandfather both bore the name of Apollinaris, and both were prætorian prefects of the Gallias. After an expensive education he became a soldier, married the daughter of Avitus, who was afterwards emperor, had three children; was captured at the siege of Lyons, A.D. 457; yet was advanced to honour by the new emperor Majorianus, whom he eulogized in 458; had a statue erected to him, and was advanced to the dignity of count. In the year 467, he went to Rome as legate from the city of Clermont; pronounced

an eulogy on the emperor Anthemius; was made *prefect* of Rome, and performed his duties so faithfully, that he had another statue decreed him, was made a *patrician* and a *senator* of Rome. In the year 472, he was almost compelled to accept the office of bishop of Clermont in France. He now laid aside all his civil honours, gave up his property to his son, and devoted himself to sacred studies and to his episcopal functions. His influence among the clergy and the churches was very great. When the Goths attacked Clermont, he put himself at the head of the citizens as their military commander; and when the city was captured in 480, he retired in safety, was restored to his see, and died in the year 482. He has left us numerous Epistles, which he himself digested into nine books; in which form they are published, with one Sermon, and twenty-four poetic effusions interspersed. Several of his works, in prose and verse, are lost. His works were published by Jac. Sirmond, Paris, 1614, 8vo, and with additional notes, Paris, 1652, 8vo. His Epistles are useful, as throwing light on the history of his times. Tr.]

³ [Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus, in Africa, flourished A.D. 484, at which time he was summoned to appear at Carthage before Hunneric, the Arian king of the Vandals, and give account of his faith. He boldly professed orthodoxy; but the persecution which followed obliged him to quit Africa, and he retired to Constantinople, and after some years removed to Italy, where he composed several, perhaps the greater part, of his works. To conceal himself from his persecuting enemies, he composed much under borrowed names, and especially that of Athanasius. During the middle ages, he was confounded with Vigilius of Trent, who flourished at the beginning of this century. His works are, five books against Nestorius and Eutyches; two Dialogues between Athanasius and Arius, supposed to have been held at the council of Nice; three Dialogues between the same; twelve books on the Trinity; a Dialogue on the Trinity, between Augustine and Pelicianus, an Arian; on the Trinity,

who commented on the Psalms of David⁴; *Dracontius*⁵; and others⁶, who were of a secondary rank.

against Varianadus; one book against Palladius, an Arian; Answers to Arian objections; Dialogue between Augustine and Pascentius, an Arian. He is likewise supposed to be the author of that Confession of Faith, which is commonly called the *Athanasian Creed*. His works were first published as his by P. F. Cliftlet, Dijon, 1664, 4to. *Tr.*—Quesnel, in a dissertation appended to Pope Leo's works, published by him in 1675, learnedly ascribes the Athanasian Creed to Vigilius Tapsensis, and that opinion, which was not absolutely new, henceforward was very commonly received. But Waterland has proved it unsound by internal evidence. The claim of Vigilius requires about 484 for a date, and the Creed seems to have been written before the council of Ephesus, in 431. Otherwise, it could hardly have wanted marks of an opposition to Nestorianism. From a deficiency of this kind, and from other evidence, Waterland concludes, that the Creed was written in Gaul, between the years 420 and 430. Its author he conceives to have been Hilary, a famous divine of that age and country, once abbot of Lerins, eventually archbishop of Arles. Waterland's *Critical History of the Athanasian Creed*. Works, iv. 136, 250, 261. *Ed.*]

⁴ An account of Arnobius junior is given in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 342. [He is called *junior*, to distinguish him from the African Arnobius, who lived at the beginning of the preceding century. This Arnobius junior is supposed to have lived in Gaul. He flourished about A.D. 461, and wrote a Commentary on the Psalms; Notes on some passages in the Gospels; and a Dispute with Serapion of Egypt, respecting the Trinity, the person of Christ, and the consistency of grace with free will. He was a Semi-Pelagian. His works are in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. viii. p. 203, &c. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Dracontius was a presbyter and a poet, probably of Spain, who flourished A.D. 440, and was alive in 450. He has left us a Heroic Poem on the Creation, or the Hexæmeron; and an Elegy on Theodosius II.; both published by J. Sirmond, Paris, 1619, 8vo; and in

the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. ix. p. 724, 729. *Tr.*]

⁶ [Catalogue of Latin writers omitted by Dr. Mosheim, extracted from the *Historia Litteraria* of Dr. Cave.

Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, a friend of Rufinus, and a defender of Chrysostom; flourished A.D. 401, and died 410. He has left us some Homilies on the Beatitudes, Matt. v., and a few Epistles.

Innocent I., bishop of Rome A.D. 402—417, a firm friend of Chrysostom, and strenuous against the Nestorians and Pelagians. Of 34 Epistles published as his, the genuineness of nearly all is questioned.

Zosimus, of Greek extract, bishop of Rome A.D. 417, 418; famous for his attempt to subject the African churches to his see. He has left us 13 Epistles.

Boniface, bishop of Rome, A.D. 418—423, prosecuted the attempt of Zosimus. We have 3 of his Epistles.

Severus, bishop of Minorea, flourished A.D. 418. His epistle, describing the conversion of the Jews of Minorea, was published by Baronius, *Annales*, ad ann. 418.

Julian, an Italian bishop, born before A.D. 386, and died about the year 440 or 450. He studied under Pelagius; became a deacon, lector, husband, and bishop of a small town among the Hirpini. In the year 417, he came out an open defender of Pelagianism; in 420 he was condemned; went to Constantinople, and thence to Cilicia, where he lived long with Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and devoted himself to writing in defence of his sentiments. In 423, he was condemned by a synod of Cilician bishops; returned to Italy in 424, hoping to recover his see; failed, and went again to Constantinople, to beg the interference of the emperor; but here Mercator's *Commonitorium* to Theodosius II. met him, and blasted his prospects. Being driven from Constantinople, and condemned in a council at Rome A.D. 431, he pretended to renounce his errors, and applied to the Roman pontiff, in 439, to restore him to his see, but in vain.—He was a man of superior talents, well acquainted with the Scriptures, and so eloquent, that he was styled the Roman Demosthenes; and likewise

famed for his piety and his benevolence to the poor. But he was accused of dissembling as to his sentiments, and of using bitter language towards his adversaries. Large extracts are preserved from his Epistles, his Commentary on the Canticles, and his twelve books against the first and second books of Augustine on marriage.

Priscus Fastidius, a British bishop, flourished A.D. 420. He has left us a tract on Christian life and widowhood, addressed to a pious widow; extant among the Works of Augustine, tom. ix.

Evdolus, bishop of Uzala, in Africa, an intimate friend of Augustine, flourished A.D. 420. Four of his Epistles to Augustine, and one book *de Fide contra Manichæos*, are extant, among the Works of Augustine.

Isidorus, bishop of Cordova in Spain, flourished A.D. 420, and died A.D. 430. He was probably the author of four books of allegories, or commentaries on all the books of Kings, extant among the Works of Isidorus Hispalensis.

Celestine, bishop of Rome, A.D. 423—432, and active in the Nestorian contests. He has left us 14 Epistles.

Lupus, bishop of Troyes in France, flourished A.D. 427. He was sent by the Gallic bishops to Britain, in 429, to root out Pelagianism; was successful, and returned in 430, and died A.D. 479. He has been pronounced one of the greatest men of his age. Two of his Epistles are extant.

Pisidius, or Possidonius, bishop of Calama, near Hippo in Africa; flourished A.D. 430. He was an intimate friend of Augustine; and wrote his life, and a catalogue of his works, still extant among the Works of Augustine.

Hilary, bishop of Arles, born A.D. 401, became a monk of Lerins, and was made bishop in 430, and died in 449. As metropolitan of Arles, he deposed Celsidionus, bishop of Vienne, who appealed to Rome, and was supported by Leo I., which involved Hilary in war with Leo all their lives. He wrote the Life of St. Honoratus, his predecessor; Heroic Poems on Genesis; one Epistle to Eucherius of Lyons; two others to Augustine; and an account of the miracles of St. Genesius: all which were published by the Benedictines, Paris, 1693, fol. and by Joh. Salina, Rome, 1731, 8vo.

Capreolus, bishop of Carthage, flourished A.D. 431. His Epistle to the council of Ephesus, and another to the

Spanish bishop, against Nestorius, are extant in Baronius, and in other collections.

Patricius (St. Patrick, the apostle of Ireland,) was born at Neanthur, (Kirkpatrick,) about the year 371; became a monk; was sent to Rome in 432, and there appointed apostle and archbishop of Ireland; returned to Ireland, and laboured successfully; went to England in 447, obtained many fellow labourers, and returning, spread Christianity far and wide in Ireland; he founded churches, ordained bishops, held councils, performed repeated miracles, and died A.D. 493, aged 122 years. He is reported to have founded 365 churches, and to have ordained as many bishops, besides 3000 presbyters; and to have baptized 12,000 persons. His life is given in full, in archbishop Ussher's *Ecclesiast. Britannicar. Primordia*, cap. xvii. His works, consisting of epistles, canons, accounts of Irish synods, &c. were published (in part, by Wilkins, *Council. Britannicæ*, tom. i. and) entire, by Ja. Ware, Lond. 1658, 8vo.

Sixtus II., bishop of Rome, A.D. 432—440, has left us several epistles. The three books on riches, chastity, false teachers, &c. are erroneously ascribed to him.

Adrian, who lived perhaps about A.D. 450, wrote an *Isagoge* (Introduction) in *S. Scripturam*; which is extant in the *Critici Londinenses*, tom. viii.

Maximus, a Gallic monk, abbot of Lerins in 426, and bishop of Riez in France A.D. 433, lived till 451 or longer, and wrote several Homilies, which are extant among those of Eusebius of Emesa, and Eucherius of Lyons.

Claudius Marius Victor, or Victorinus, a rhetorician and poet of Marseilles; flourished A.D. 434, and died before A.D. 450. He wrote a *Poetic Commentary on Genesis*, to the death of Abraham; a poetic *Epistle to the abbot Solomon*, on the corrupt morals of the age; both extant, Paris, 1560, 8vo, and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. viii. p. 680.

Celcius Sedulius, a Scotchman and poet, who flourished A.D. 434. He studied in Italy, became a presbyter, and perhaps a bishop. His works were collected, by Tur. Ruf. Asterius, towards the close of this century; comprising *Carmen Paschale*, (on the miracles of Christ,) in five books; *Veteris et Novi Test. Collatio*, an Elegiac poem; *Pæan Alphabeticus de Christo*, in Iambic

measure (on the life of Christ); and *Paschalis Operis libri v.* in prose. An *Exposition of all the Epp. of Paul* is falsely ascribed to him. The works of Sedulius have been published repeatedly, and are to be found in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. vi.

Valerianus, a bishop in the maritime Alps; flourished A. D. 439, and was alive in 455. His 20 Homilies and an Epistle were published by Ja. Sirmond, Paris, 1612, 8vo; also, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, tom. viii.

Eustathius, flourished A. D. 440, the neat Latin translator of St. Basil's nine Homilies on the Hexaëmeron; extant among the works of Basil the Great.

Philippus, a presbyter, and disciple of Jerome; flourished A. D. 440, and died A. D. 455. He wrote a *Commentary on Job*, in three books; published, Basil, 1527, 4to and fol. It has been ascribed both to Beda and to Jerome.

Idatius, or Hydatius, a Spanish bishop, who flourished A. D. 445, and died, A. D. 468. He wrote a *Chronicon*, from A. D. 379 to A. D. 428; and afterwards continued it to A. D. 467; first published, entire, by Ja. Sirmond, Paris, 1619, 8vo; and since, in the Works of Sirmond, Paris, 1696, and Venice, 1729. It is barbarous in style, and frequently inaccurate as to facts; yet affords valuable aid in tracing the movements of the Goths and Suevi.

Zachæus, the reputed author of three books of discussion, between Zachæus a Christian, and Apollonius a pagan, in regard to Christianity. The book was probably written about A. D. 450; and is published in L. Dacherii *Spicilegium*, tom. x.

Salonius, son of Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, and himself a Gallic bishop, flourished A. D. 453. He wrote an *Exposition of the Parables of Solomon*; and a *Mystical Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes*: both extant, in the *Orthodoxographia*, and in *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. viii.

Victorius, or Victorinus, a Gallic mathematician; flourished A. D. 457; author of a *Paschal Canon*, in two parts; the first part exhibits the principles and the method of calculating Easter; the second is a table of Easter days from A. D. 28 to A. D. 457. This Canon was recommended by the council of Orleans, A. D. 541, and was first published by Aëgid. Bucherius, Antw. 1634, fol.

Hilary, bishop of Rome, A. D. 461—467. He was the bishop of Rome's

legate to the council of Ephesus in 449. Twelve of his Epistles are extant.

Paulinus Petricordius, or Vesuntius, (i. e. of Besançon,) a Gallic poet, who flourished A. D. 461, and is often confounded with Paulinus of Nola. He wrote, *de Vita Sti Martini*, libri vi., an uninteresting poem, extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. vi. and published by Daunius, with notes, Lips. 1686, 8vo.

Claudius Mamertus, a Gallic poet, a presbyter, and assistant to the bishop of Vicnne; flourished A. D. 462. He wrote *de Statu Animæ*, libri iii.; two Epistles; a *Poem against various errors*; and a *Hymn on the Crucifixion*; all extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. vii.

Simplicius, bishop of Rome, A. D. 467—483. He was much engaged in contests with the eastern patriarchs; and has left us nineteen Epistles; extant in *Councilor*, tom. iv.

Ruricius, senior, bishop of Limoges, in France; flourished A. D. 470, but was alive in 506. He has left us two books of Epistles; published by H. Canisius, *Antiq. Lectiones*, tom. v. (or tom. i. of new ed.) and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. viii.

Remigius, bishop of Rheims, A. D. 471—533. He baptized Clovis, king of the Franks, with many of his lords; was a man of note; and has left us five Epistles, together with his Will. The Exposition of Paul's Epistles, attributed to him, is not his.

Faustus, abbot of Lerins, and, then bishop of Riez, in France, A. D. 472—480, or 485; a Semi-Pelagian. His works are, *de Gratia Dei et Libero Arbitrio*, libri ii. with several Sermons, Epistles, and Tracts; collected in *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. viii.

Felix, bishop of Rome, A. D. 483—492; was much in controversy with the eastern patriarchs. Fifteen of his Epistles are extant.

Victor Vitensis, an orthodox African bishop, who fled to Constantinople A. D. 487, and there composed a *History of the Persecutions in Africa*, under Genseric and Hunneric, kings of the Vandals. It was published with *Optatus Milevitanus*, Paris, 1659, 8vo; with Vigilius Tapsensis, Dijon, 1664, 4to; and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. viii.

Aleimus Ecdicius Avitus, bishop of Clermont, A. D. 490—523. He has left us five poetic books, *On the Creation and Fall of Man, the Flood, and the Passage of the Red Sea*; a poem in praise of *Virginity*; eighty-seven Epistles; and some

Sermons; published by Ja. Sirmond, Paris, 1643; and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. ix.

Gelasius, bishop of Rome, A.D. 492—496. Sixteen of his Epistles, and fragments of various other works, are extant. The famous decree of a Roman council, A.D. 494, *de Libris Canonicis, Ecclesiasticis, et Apocryphis*, ascribed to Gelasius, is of dubious authenticity.

Genadius, a presbyter of Marseilles, flourished A.D. 495; and wrote *de-Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, or a catalogue of authors, continuing Jerome's catalogue, from the year 393 to A.D. 495. His book *de Fide*, and his *Life of Jerome*, are also extant. But his eight books against all the heresies, his six books against Nestorius, his three books against Pelagius, his Tract on the Millennium,

and his translations from the Greek fathers, are lost.

Rusticius Elpidius, physician to Theodoric, king of the Goths; flourished about A.D. 498; and has left twenty-four Epigrams on Scriptural facts, and a Poem on the *Benefits of Christ*.

Julianus Pomerius, of Mauritania; a teacher of rhetoric at Arles, and a presbyter there; flourished A.D. 498. His eight books *de Anima*, and several smaller works, are lost. But his three books *de Vita Contemplativa*, are extant among the works of Prosper; to whom they have been wrongly ascribed.

Symmachus, bishop of Rome, A.D. 498—514; famous for his excommunication of the emperor Anastasius; has left us twelve Epistles. *Tr.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Many points in theology better ascertained.—§ 2. Increase of superstition.—§ 3. Interpretation of the Scriptures.—§ 4. Most of the interpreters incompetent.—§ 5. Some were more able.—§ 6. State of dogmatic theology.—§ 7. Theological disputants.—§ 8. Their faults.—§ 9. Hence supposititious books.—§ 10. Moral writers.—§ 11. Mystics.—§ 12. Superstition of the Stylites.—§ 13. Further defects of the moralists.—§ 14. *Jerome's* controversy with *Vigilantius*.—§ 15. Controversies respecting *Origen*.

§ 1. IN the controversies which in this century agitated nearly all Christendom, many points of theology were more fully explained, and more accurately defined, than they had been before. Thus it was with the doctrine concerning *Christ*, his person and natures; and those concerning the innate depravity of the human soul, the natural ability of men to live and act as the law of God requires, the necessity of divine grace in order to salvation, human liberty, and the like. For that devout and venerable simplicity of the first ages of the church, which made men believe when God speaks, and obey when he commands, was thought by the chief doctors of this age to be only fit for clowns. Many of those, however, who attempted to explain and

illustrate these doctrines, rather opened ways for disputing than for believing wisely, and living religiously; nor did they so much explain divine mysteries, as involve them in the perplexing folds of subtleties, ambiguous terms, and nice distinctions. To this posterity owes that most abundant crop of ills, contentions, and animosities, which almost baffles human powers. It might be remarked, besides, that some, while pressing adversaries too far, incautiously fell into errors the opposite of theirs, but not less dangerous.

§ 2. The superstitious notions and human devices by which religion was before much clogged, were very considerably augmented. Innumerable suppliants implored the aid of blest spirits which were thought to live with God: no one censuring this preposterous piety¹. Nor did the question, which afterwards occasioned much debate, namely, in what way the prayers of mortals could reach the ears of residents in heaven, present any difficulties to the Christians of those times. For they did not suppose the souls of saints to be so confined above, as to want means of visiting mortals at their pleasure, and of travelling over various regions. No where, however, were disembodied spirits believed to be more willing and frequent visiters, than in the places where their bodies were interred. And this opinion, which Christians had received from the Greeks and Romans, drew a great conflux of supplicants to the sepulchres of the saints². The images of those who were in reputation for sanctity while alive, were now honoured with extraordinary devotion in several places; nor were those wanting who thought such figures kindly graced by the presence of the heavenly personages whom they represented: the very doctrine which pagan priests had formerly applied to statues of Jupiter and Mercury³. Than the bones of martyrs and the sign of the cross,

¹ [Extracts containing calls upon the saintly dead, may be seen in the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses*, cent. 4, col. 296. Nevertheless, the practice was so unauthorised, and liable to such palpable objection, from reasonable doubts as to the omniscience of the spirits invoked, that the church was rather cautious in committing herself to it. Her first approaches were prayers to God, that the saints might be found intercessors, not prayers to the venerable dead themselves. *Ed.*]

² Lactantius, *Divinar. Instit.* lib. i. p. 164. Hesiod, *Opp. et Dier.* v. 122. With which compare Sulpitius Severus, *Epist.* ii. p. 371. *Dial.* ii. c. 13, p. 471. *Dial.* iii. p. 512. Aeneas Gaxeus, *Thaophrastus*, p. 65. Macarius, in *Ja. Tollii Insignia Itinæris Italici*, p. 197, and other writers of that age.

³ *Clementina*, Homil. x. in *Patr. Apostol.* tom. i. p. 697. Arnobius, *adv. Gent.*, lib. vi. p. 254, &c. Casp. Barthius, *ad Rutilium Numantian.* p. 250.

hardly any thing was believed more powerful to repel the assaults of evil spirits, and calamities of every kind, or to heal, not only bodily diseases, but likewise those of the mind⁴. On the public processions, the holy pilgrimages⁵, the superstitious services paid by the living to the souls of the dead, the multiplication and extravagant veneration of temples, chapels, and altars, and innumerable other proofs of degenerate piety, I forbear to speak particularly. As no one in those times prohibited Christians from retaining and transferring the opinions of their pagan ancestors respecting the soul, heroes, demons, temples, and the like, and transferring them into their devotions; as no one proposed utterly to abolish the ancient pagan institutions, but only to alter them somewhat, and purify them; it was unavoidable, that the religion and worship of Christians should be contaminated by these faults. This also I will add, that the doctrine of some sort of fire to purge souls after death, which eventually gained so much wealth for the sacred order, now came forth with a publicity and authority hitherto unknown⁶.

⁴ Prudentius, *Hymn. xi. de Coronis*, p. 150, 151. Sulpitius Severus, *Epist. i. p. 364*. Aeneas-Gazæus, *Theophrastus*, p. 173, ed. Barth.

⁵ [These pilgrimages were then so common, that some Christians fell into absurdities truly ridiculous. They journeyed quite to Arabia, in order to see the dunghill on which the diseased Job sat, and to kiss the ground which had absorbed his precious blood; as Chrysostom describes it, (*Homily v. to the Antiochians*), where he says, in his rhetorical way, that the dunghill of Job was more venerable than the throne of a king. *Schl.*]

⁶ On this subject, Augustine deserves especially to be consulted, *de Oco Questionibus ad Dulcitium Liber*, c. xiii, Opp. tom. vi. p. 128; *de Fide et Operibus*, c. xvi. p. 182; *de Fide, Spe, et Caritate*, § 118. p. 222; *Exposition of Psalm xxxv. § iii. &c.* [The well-known passage of Virgil shows no less clearly than finely, the pagan origin of this purgatorial doctrine.

*Quin et, supremo cum lavine, rita reliquit,
Non tamen omne malum miseris, nec fanditas omnes
Corporeæ excedunt pestes; penitusque necesse est
Multa diu conercta modis inolescere miris.*

*Ergo exercentur poenis, veterumque malorum
Supplicia capientur. Alie panduntur
Invenio*

*Suspense ad ventos; aliis sub gurgite vasto
Infectum cluitur seculus, aut exaritur igni:
Quisque suos putat; Manes; exinde per
angulam*

*Mittitur Elysium, et pauci lata arca
tenemus.*

Æn. vi. 735.

That the lingering infection of human wickedness was to be burnt out by fire, became at length the prevailing hypothesis. Christians were Scripturally taught, 2 Pet. iii. 10, to expect a final conflagration, and pagan prepossessions led them to give this the same purifying properties that had been usually given to the Deluge, only much more complete. One opinion was, accordingly, that all mankind will have to pass through the final conflagration to judgment, and will suffer more or less individually, in proportion to the degrees of iniquity waiting to be burnt out. In time, the difficulties in the way of this hypothesis displaced it by the general belief of a permanent purgatory, in which the process of burning out worldly pollution may be constantly going on. *Ed.*]

§ 3. The number of those who devoted their talents to the explanation of the Scriptures, was not so great as in the preceding century, when there was less of controversy among Christians; and yet the number was not small. I merely name such as expounded only one or a few books of Scripture, namely, *Victor* of Antioch, *Polychronius*, *Philo* of Carpathus, *Isidore* of Cordova, *Salonius*, and *Andreas* of Casarca. The two most distinguished interpreters of this century, and who explained a great part of the sacred volume, and not altogether without success, were *Theodoret*, bishop of Cyrus, and *Theodore* of Mopsuestia. Both excelled in genius and learning, and would not follow in the footsteps of those who preceded them without some reason. The expositions of the former are before the public⁷; those of the latter lie concealed in the East, among the Nestorians, and are worthy, for various reasons, to see the light⁸. *Cyril* of Alexandria deserves a place among the interpreters; but a far more honourable one is due to *Isidore* of Pelusium, whose epistles contain various things extremely useful for understanding and explaining the sacred books⁹.

§ 4. Most of these interpreters, whether Greek or Latin, constantly re-echo *Origen's* old note, and hunt for abstruse meanings, or, as the Latins of those times commonly say, *mysteries*, in the plainest expressions and sentences, taking no notice whatever of the force and power in the words themselves. Some of the Greeks, indeed, and in particular *Theodoret*, laboured not unsuccessfully in explaining the pages of the New Testament: which we may ascribe to their acquaintance with the Greek language, with which they had been familiar from their infancy. But upon the Hebrew Scriptures, neither the Greeks nor the Latins cast much light. Nearly all who attempted to explain them making no use of their judgment, applied the whole either to *Christ* and his benefits, or to *Anti-Christ* and his wars and desolations, and to the kindred subjects.

§ 5. Here and there one, however, more sagacious and wiser

⁷ See Rich. Simon, *Histoire Critique des Principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Test.* cap. xxii. p. 314, and *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclésiast. de M. du Pin*, tom. i. p. 180, [and note⁶, p. 435, above. Tr.]

⁸ Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vaticanæ*, tom. iii. § ii. p. 227. Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Biblioth.*

Ecclésiast. par M. du Pin, tom. i. p. 103. 677. [See also note², p. 437, above. Tr.]

⁹ Concerning both, see Rich. Simon, *Histoire des Principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Test.* c. xxi. p. 300, &c. [For some account of Cyril, see note⁵, p. 434, and concerning Isidore, note⁸, p. 436, above. Tr.]

than the rest, ventured to point out a safer path. This is evident from the Epistles of *Isidore* of Pelusium, who, in various places, censures, in a pertinent manner, such as, disregarding the *historic* sense, referred all the narrative and prophetic parts of the Old Testament to *Christ*; and yet he himself was by no means entirely free from the fault of his age—the love and pursuit of allegories. No one went further in censuring the imitators of *Origen* than *Theodore* of Mopsuestia. He not only wrote a book *concerning allegory and history against Origen*¹, but also, in his own *Commentaries* on the Prophets of the Old Testament, ventured to explain most of their predictions with reference to events in ancient history². And this his method of explaining the Old Testament perhaps raised as much ill will against him, as those other sentiments which brought on him the charge of heresy. The example of this excellent man was followed especially by the Nestorians³; nor have they yet ceased to follow it, for they preserve his books with care, and venerate him as a saint of the highest order.

§ 6. It is very evident, that the doctrines of religion were not exhibited with sufficient purity and simplicity by most persons; but were sometimes drawn out with a zeal little to be commended, beyond the limits which divine revelation assigns to them; were anatomised with too much art and subtlety; and were substantiated, not so much by the declarations of the Holy Scriptures, as by the authority and logical reasonings of the ancient doctors. I know of no one who embraced a complete system of Christian doctrines in a single work, unless we may choose to say this of *Nicæas* of Romacia, in the *six books of instruction for Neophytes*, which he is said to have composed⁴.

¹ Facundus Hermianensis, *de Tribus Capitulis*, lib. iii. c. 6. Liberatus, *Breviarium*, c. xxiv.

² *Acta Concilii Constantinop. II. seu Oecumenici* V. tom. iii. p. 58. *Concilior.* ed. Harduin.

³ One witness, among others, is Cosmas Indicopleustes, a writer of the sixth century, who is known to have been a Nestorian. For he says, in his *Topographia*, lib. v. (p. 224, 225, of the *Collectio nova Patrum Græcor.* published by Bernh. Montfaucon,) "Among all the Psalms of David, only four refer to *Christ*;" and to confirm this sentiment, he does not hesitate to declare, (p. 227,) "That the writers of the New

Testament, when they apply the prophecies of the Old Testament to Jesus Christ, follow the *words* rather than the *sense*," [See also C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. v. p. 880. *Tr.*]

⁴ Gemadius Massiliensis, *de Scripturis Ecclesiast.* cap. 22, p. 14, ed. Fabric. [The work is lost; but from the account of Gemadius, it was no *System of Theology*. *Tr.*—Du Pin, in his *New Eccl. Hist.* iii. 120, has a translation of the account which Gemadius gives of this author's work. He is described as "bishop of some town in Romania," *Ed.*]

But it has been already observed, that various doctrines of religion were laboriously explained, especially in the controversial works against the Nestorians, Eutychians, Pelagians, and Arians.

§ 7. Of controversial writers, a great number can be mentioned: and, indeed, many of this description were required by the many contests that existed. The worshippers of the pagan images and gods were vigorously assailed by *Theodoret*, in his book, *De curandis Grecorum affectionibus*, which displays much genius and erudition; by *Orientius*, in his *Commonitorium*; and by *Evagrius*, in his *Disputation* between *Zachæus* and *Apollonius*⁵. To these may be added *Philip* of Side and *Philostorgius*; of whom the former wrote against *Julian*, and the latter against *Porphyry*⁶. The Jews were confuted by *Basil* of Seleucia⁷; by *Gregentius*, in his *Disputation with Herbanus*; and by *Evagrius*, in his *Dialogue between Theophilus and a Jew*. Against all the heretics, something was attempted by *Voconius*, an African; by *Syagrius*, in his tract *de Fide*; by *Gennadius* of Marseilles; and, best of all, by *Theodoret*⁸, in his work *de Fabulis Hæreticorum*. Those who attacked only individual sects are here omitted.

§ 8. Such of these as contended against the Christian sectarists, followed the rules of the ancient sophists, and also (what is truly surprising,) the practice of the Roman courts, rather than the examples and instructions of *Christ* and his apostles. In the Roman courts, very difficult and doubtful points were decided according to the opinions of certain ancient jurists. If these happened to disagree, that opinion was preferred which was maintained by the greatest number, or by the jurists of most learning and reputation⁹. It was very preju-

⁵ For an account of *Orientius* and *Evagrius*, see the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 121, and 252. [*Orientius*, called also *Orontius*, and *Oresius*, was bishop of Aux in France, perhaps also of Tarragona in Spain. His *Commonitorium*, which is written in heroic verse, was published, book I. by *Martin Debrío*, Antwerp, 1600, and book II. by *Edm. Martene*, in his *Nova Collectio Operum Ecclesiast. Vet.* Paris, 1700. This *Evagrius* is not the noted *Evagrius Scholasticus* of the sixth century, but was a French priest, and a disciple of St. Martin. His *Altercatio*

Simonis Judei et Theophili Christiani, is found in *Martene's Anecdota*; and his *Consultationes*, seu *Deliberationes Zachæi Christiani et Apollonii Philosophi*, is in the *Spicilegium* of D'Achery, tom. x. *Schd.*]

⁶ [Neither of the works here mentioned is extant. *Tr.*]

⁷ [For some account of this *Basil*, and of his writings, see note ⁴, p. 433, above. *Tr.*]

⁸ [An account of *Theodoret*, and of his writings, is given in note ⁶, p. 435, above. *Tr.*]

⁹ See *Codex Theodosianus*, lib. i. tit.

dicial to the interests of truth, that this usage of the Roman courts was adopted as a rule in the controversies of Christians on subjects of religion, and followed in the deliberations of the councils of this century. For, by it, *that* was sanctioned and regarded as confirmed, which had been judged true and certain by the major part, or by the most learned and distinguished, of the doctors in former times. This appears from nearly all the Acts of Councils now extant. The other faults of the theological disputants may be easily inferred from what has now been stated.

§ 9. This imitation, in religious controversies, of the practice among Roman jurists, greatly inflamed the base audacity of those who did not blush to palm their own spurious productions on the great men of former times, and even on *Christ* himself and his apostles, so that they might be able, in the councils and in their books, to oppose names against names, and authorities against authorities. The whole Christian church was, in this century, overwhelmed with these disgraceful fictions. And this, it is said, occasioned the Roman pontiff, *Gelasius*, to assemble at Rome a convention of bishops from all the Latin world, and after examining the books which were professedly the works of persons of the highest authority, to draw up that famous decree, by which so many *apocryphal* books are completely stripped of reputation. That something of this kind was actually done, cannot well be denied; but men of superior learning maintain, that this pretended decree of *Gelasius* is of no better authority than those books which it condemns; that is, they believe it not the production of *Gelasius*, but of some one who abused his name¹.

§ 10. Among those who treated on the subject of morals, *Eucherius*, *Salvian*, and *Nilus*, stand conspicuous. The epistle of *Eucherius* especially, on *Contempt of the world and secular*

iv. de *Responsis Prudentum*, p. 32, ed. Ritter.

¹ Jo. Pearson, *Vindicie Ignatiane*, pt. i. c. iv. p. 169, &c. Wm. Cave, *Historia Liter. Script. Ecclesiast.* p. 260. Urb. Godofr. Siberus, *Præf. ad Enchiridion Scoti*, p. 79, and others. [This Decree is ascribed, by most of the MSS., to Gelasius I.; but by some to Damasus, and by others to Hormisdas. It is not quoted by any writer before the ninth century. It mentions

some books which were not in being in the age of Gelasius; and it contains some sentiments and arguments which savour of a later age. It may be found in, perhaps, all the larger Collections of Councils; in Binius, vol. ii., in Labbé, vol. iv., in Harduin, vol. ii., in Mansi, *Supplm.* vol. i., also in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, Decret. Gratian, pt. i. Distinct. xv. cap. iii. Tr.]

philosophy, will recommend itself to every good man, both from style and matter. The short pieces of *Mark*, the hermit, breathe a spirit of piety; but do not please, either by choice of subjects, or arrangement, or, in short, by weight of reasoning. *Fastidius* composed various tracts concerning moral duties and virtues, which are all lost². The productions in this department of *Diadochus*, *Prosper*, and *Severianus*, are interesting, with a few exceptions, for the truth and terseness of the thoughts; but will afford little satisfaction to one fond of solid argumentation and well-digested composition. Indeed, it was a fault common to nearly all the moral writers of those times, that they had no idea of a regular distribution of their subject into parts, or of tracing it back to its first principles.

§ 11. This fault might indeed be put up with, and be ascribed to the infelicity of the times, by the more candid; but we see other injuries done to the cause of piety by inconsiderate men. In the first place, the *mystics*, as they are called, who pretended to be more perfect than other Christians, drew many every where among the weak and thoughtless, especially in the eastern provinces, who were allured, by the appearance of their extraordinary and self-denying piety, to become of their party. And it is incredible what rigorous and severe laws they imposed on themselves, in order to appease God, and deliver the *celestial spirit* from the body's bondage. To live among wild beasts,—nay, in the manner of these beasts; to roam about like madmen, in desert places, and without garments; to feed their emaciated bodies with hay and grass; to shun the converse and even the sight of men; to stand motionless in certain places, for many years, exposed to the weather; to shut themselves up in confined cabins, till life ended;—this was accounted piety; this the true method of eliciting the [spark of] Deity from the secret recesses of the soul³. The greater part of these people were influenced, not so much by arguments and assignable reasons, as by either a natural propensity to melancholy and austerity, or by the example and opinions of others. For there are diseases of the mind, as well as of the body, which spread

² [Except his tract *On a Christian Life and Widowhood*, addressed to a pious widow, which is preserved among the works of *Augustine*, tom. ix. *Tr.*]

³ See *Moschus*, *Prætion Spirituale*; *Palladius*, *Historia Lausica*; *Sulpitius Severus*, *Dial.* i. and others.

like a pestilence. Yet there were some who gave systematic precepts for this austere mode of living; for instance, among the Latins, *Julianus Pomerius*, in his three books *de vita contemplativa*; and, among the Syrians, many whose names it is needless to mention.

§ 12. Among these examples of religious fatuity, none acquired greater veneration and applause than those who were called *Pillar-Saints* (*Sancti Columnares*), or in Greek, *Stylites*; persons of a singular spirit and genius, who stood motionless on the tops of lofty columns, during many years, even to the end, in fact, of life, to the great astonishment of the ignorant multitude. This scheme originated in the present century with *Simeon* of Syzan, a Syrian; at first a shepherd, then a monk; who, in order to be nearer heaven, spent thirty-seven years in the most uncomfortable manner, on the tops of five different pillars, of six, twelve, twenty-two, thirty-six, and forty cubits elevation; and in this way procured for himself immense fame and veneration⁴. His example was afterwards

⁴ See the *Acta Sanctorum*, for the month of January, tom. i. p. 261, &c. where is expressly stated (p. 277,) the very reason I have mentioned for his living in this manner. Theodoret also indicates the same by saying, that Simeon desired gradually to increase the altitude of his pillar, that he might get nearer to heaven. Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. xv. p. 347, ed. Paris. The *Acta S. Simeonis Stylitæ* are most fully related in Steph. Eud. Asseman's *Acta Martyrum Oriental. et Occidental.* vol. ii. p. 227, Rome, 1748, fol.—[This Simeon, we are told, was born at Syzan in Syria, about A. D. 390. At the age of thirteen, while tending his father's sheep, he heard a public exposition of Luke vi. 21. 25, ("Blessed are ye, that weep now, &c. But woe unto you that laugh now, &c.") which determined him to become a monk. Having therefore passed a novitiate of two years, he removed to a monastery near Antioch, where he lived ten years. Here his abstinence and his voluntary mortifications were so excessive, as to draw on him censure from the other monks. He once swathed himself from his loins to his neck, with a rigid well rope of palm during ten days, which caused his whole body to fester and discharge blood. Being expelled the mo-

nastery for such austerities, he retired to the adjacent mountain, and let himself down into a dry cave. After five days, the repenting monks sought him out, drew him forth from the cavern, and restored him to their fellowship. But not long after, he retired to a little cell, at the foot of a mountain near Antioch, and there immured himself three years. During this period, having caused his den to be stopped up with earth, he remained buried for forty days, without eating or drinking; and when disinterred, was found nearly dead. So pleased was he with this experiment, that he afterwards kept such a fast annually, as long as he lived. He next removed to the top of the mountain; where he chained himself to a rock for several years. His fame had now become very great; and crowds of admiring visitors, of all ranks and characters, thronged around him. He instructed them, healed their diseases, and converted heretics, pagans, and Jews, in great numbers. Incommoded by the pressure of the crowd, he erected a pillar on which he might stand; elevated, at first, six cubits; then twelve, twenty-two, thirty-six; and, at last, forty cubits. The top of the pillar was three feet in diameter, and surrounded with a balustrade. Here he stood, day and

followed, though not equalled, by many persons in Syria and Palestine; either from ignorance of true religion, or from love of fame, even down to the twelfth century, when this stupid form of religion was entirely abolished⁵. The Latins had wisdom enough to keep them from copying the Syrians and orientals in this matter. When, accordingly, one *Wulfilaicus* built himself such a pillar in the German territory of Treves, and wished to live upon it in the manner of *Simeon*, the neighbouring bishops pulled it down, and forbade the man to pursue his object⁶.

§ 13. Those who undertook to instruct the less advanced in Christian knowledge, were at more pains to inculcate and recommend the external signs of religion and exercises of the body, than to promote that real holiness which has its seat in the soul. Many, accordingly, so went beyond all bounds, that they required an extreme of *austere virtue*, little short of the ill-advised piety of the *mystics*. According to the sentiments of *Salvian* and others, no one can become truly and

night, and in all weathers. Through the night, and till nine A.M., he was constantly in prayer, often spreading forth his hands, and bowing so low that his forehead touched his toes. A bystander once attempted to count the number of these successive prostrations, and he counted till they amounted to 1244. At nine o'clock A.M. he began to address the admiring crowd below, to hear and answer their questions, to send messages and write letters, &c.; for he took concern in the welfare of all the churches, and corresponded with bishops and even with emperors. Towards evening he suspended his intercourse with this world, and betook himself again to converse with God till the following day. He generally ate but once a week; never slept; wore a long sheepskin robe, and a cap of the same. His beard was very long, and his frame extremely emaciated. In this manner he is reported to have spent thirty-seven years; and at last, in his sixty-ninth year, to have expired unobserved, in a praying attitude, in which no one ventured to disturb him, till after three days; when Antony, his disciple and biographer, mounting the pillar, found that his spirit was departed, and his holy body was emitting a delightful odour. His remains were borne, in great pomp, to Antioch, in order to

be the safeguard of that unwall'd town; and innumerable miracles were performed at his shrine. His pillar also was so venerated, that it was literally enclosed with chapels and monasteries for some ages. Simeon was so averse from women, that he never allowed one to come within the sacred precincts of his pillar. Even his own mother was debarred this privilege, till after her death, when her corpse was brought to him; and he now restored her to life, for a short time, that she might see him and converse with him a little, before she ascended to heaven.—Such is the story gravely told us by the greatest writers of that age; and as gravely repeated, in modern times, by Roman Catholic historians. *Tr.*—Pagan India still supplies gloomy fanatics resembling Simeon, and admirers like his contemporaries; a plain proof that his austerities were a graft from gentilism, the great religious evil of his day, and still at work upon the Christian Church. *Ed.]*

⁵ See Urb. Godofr. Siber, *Diss. de Sanctis Columnaribus*, Lips. 4to, and Carol. Majell, *Diss. de Stylitibus*; in Asseman's *Acta Martyr. Orient. et Occident.* tom. ii. p. 246, where there is a copper-plate of Simeon's pillar.

⁶ Gregor. Turonens. *Historia Francor.* lib. viii. c. xv. p. 387, &c.

perfectly holy, unless he abandons altogether his property and honours, contemns matrimony, banishes all hilarity from his mind, and subjects his body to a variety of mortifications and inconveniences. As there were few who could bear the severity of these rules, the veneration for men, either void of reason, or fanatical and piously foolish, whose temperament was fit for these habits, increased wonderfully, and saints sprang up like mushrooms.

§ 14. A few, indeed, were bold enough to cut up growing superstition by the roots, and to call men away from a vain and fictitious piety to God's genuine service. But these were soon bidden to hold their peace, by others who were more numerous, in higher reputation, and possessed of greater influence⁷. An example we have in *Vigilantius*, a presbyter of Gallic extract, but resident in Spain, a learned and eloquent man. After a journey to Palestine and Egypt, returning home near the beginning of this century, he gave, in several tracts, lessons and admonitions contrary to the opinions and habits of his age. Among other things, he denied that the tombs and the bones of the martyrs were worthy of any religious worship; and, therefore, he censured pilgrimages undertaken to places accounted sacred: he ridiculed the miracles which were said to take place in the temples consecrated to the martyrs; and condemned the practice of keeping vigils in them: he said that the custom of burning wax candles in the day time, at the sepulchres of the martyrs, was imprudently borrowed by Christians from the ancient superstition of the pagans: he maintained that prayers addressed to departed saints were fruitless: he treated with contempt the [prevailing] fasts, the celibacy of the clergy, and the monastic life: and he maintained that such as distributed all their goods among the poor, in order to live in voluntary poverty, and such as sent portions of their property to Jerusalem, did nothing pleasing and acceptable to God. These sentiments were not offensive to several of the Gallic and Spanish bishops. But the most renowned monk of that age, *Jerome*, attacked this bold religious reformer with so much acrimony, that he readily saw he must be silent, if he would regard his life and safety. This effort, therefore, to check the reigning superstition, was crushed

⁷ Augustine himself complains of this, in his noted *Epistle* exix. ad Januarium.

in its commencement*. The good man's name still remains in the lists of *heretics*, which are recognized by those who follow not their own judgment, and that of Holy Scripture, but that of antiquity.

§ 15. The contests, moved in Egypt near the close of the preceding century, respecting *Origen*, were in this century prosecuted at the court of Constantinople, with little of either prudence or decency. The monks of Nitria, who were banished from Egypt, on account of *Origen*, took refuge at Constantinople, and were treated by *John Chrysostom*, the bishop of that city, with candour and kindness. As soon as this was known by *Theophilus* of Alexandria, he began to plot against *Chrysostom*; and, sending the renowned *Vigilantius* with several other bishops to Constantinople, he endeavoured to deprive that most eloquent prelate of his office. The time was a favourable one for his purpose; for *Chrysostom*, by the strictness of his discipline, and by the severity with which he lashed the vices of the times, and particularly those of some ladies of the court, had incurred the most violent resentment of many, and especially of *Eudoxia*, the wife of *Arcadius* the emperor. *Eudoxia*, therefore, enflamed by fury, invited *Theophilus* and the Egyptian bishops to come to Constantinople, assemble a council, and inquire into the religion, morals, and official conduct of *Chrysostom*. This council, which was held in the suburb of Chalcedon in the year 403, and had *Theophilus* for its president, declared *Chrysostom* unworthy of the episcopal office, among other causes, on account of his too great attachment to *Origen* and the followers of *Origen*; and accordingly decreed his banishment. The people of Constantinople, who were exceedingly attached to their bishop, became tumultuous, and im-

* Peter Bayle; *Dictionnaire Historique*, article *Vigilantius*. Jean Barbeyrac, *de la Morale des Pères*, p. 252. Gerh. Joh. Vossius, *Theses Historico-Theologicae*, p. 170. *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 57, &c. [That *Vigilantius* was an honest and correct theologian, and that his name ought to be erased from the list of *heretics*, appears highly probable, from a candid examination of the whole subject. See C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzer-eyen*, vol. iii. p. 673—704; and Vogel's *Disputation before Dr. Walch*, Gottingen, 1756, de *Vigilantio Hære-*

tico Orthodoxo. Tr.—As a strong, though tacit proof of the prevailing rage for celibacy, *Vigilantius* said, that the bishops, hopeless otherwise of continence, would ordain none but married men deacons. (*Cent. Magd.* cent. iv. col. 603.) None of his writings are extant,—a fate which they could hardly escape from the established and increasing popularity of the principles and practices that they exposed. Enough, however, of them is known, to show that paganism did not gain firm footing in the church of Christ without remark or opposition. *Ed.*]

peded the execution of this unjust sentence. But the tumult subsiding, the same judges, the next year, A.D. 401, in order to gratify their own enmity and that of *Eudoxia*, renewed their sentence under another pretext; and *Chrysostom* surrendering himself to his enemies, went into banishment at *Cucusus*, a city of Cilicia, where he died, three years after⁹. His departure was followed by a great insurrection of the *Johannists* (for so his partisans were called), which the edicts of *Honorius* with difficulty suppressed¹. That the proceedings against *Chrysostom* were most unjust, no one doubts; yet he had been wrong in this, that he determined to avail himself of the elevation decreed to the bishops of his see by the council of Constantinople, and to assume the prerogatives of a *judge* in the contest between *Theophilus* and the monks, which greatly exasperated the Alexandrian prelate. The monks of Nitria having lost their patron, sought a reconciliation with *Theophilus*: but the *Origenist* party still continued to flourish in Egypt, Syria, and the neighbouring countries, and made Jerusalem the home, as it were, and centre of the sect².

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES AND RITES.

§ 1. Rites greatly augmented.—§ 2. General description of them.—§ 3. Love-feasts. Penitence.

§ 1. To recount all the regulations made in this century respecting the mode of worship, and religious rites and institutions, would require a volume of considerable size. The curious in these matters must examine the acts of councils, and the works left us by writers of more than ordinary celebrity. Among these there were, however, some who could not be

⁹ See the authors referred to in the preceding century; to whom add the writers on the Life of *Chrysostom*, viz. Tillemont, Hermont, and others: and *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique et Crit.* tom. i. 79, 80. [See also note², p. 325, above; and *Socrates, Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. c. 9—18. *Sozomen, H. E.*

lib. viii. c. 13—22. *Tr.*]

¹ See his three Laws, with the notes of Godofroi, in the *Codex Theodosianus*, tom. v. p. 83, 113, &c.

² See *Cyrilli Vita Sabce*, in *Cotelier, Monumenta Eccles. Græcæ*, tom. ii. p. 274. *Jos. Sim. Asseman, Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. ii. p. 31, &c.

so corrupted by the bad examples of their age, as to be kept from ingenuously acknowledging that true piety in the soul was oppressed by that enormous load of ceremonies. This evil originated, in part, from the degeneracy and indolence of the teachers; in part, from the calamities of the times, which were unfavourable to mental cultivation; and in part, from the innate depravity of man, which disposes him more readily to offer to God the service of his limbs and his eyes, than of his heart.

§ 2. Public worship assumed every where, more and more, a form calculated for show and for the gratification of the eye. Various ornaments were added to the sacerdotal garments, to increase the people's reverence for the sacred order. The new kinds of hymns, and prayers, supplications, could not easily be enumerated. In Gaul, particularly, were instituted the *Rogations*, or supplications, which precede¹ the festal day of *Christ's* ascension². In some places it was appointed that the praises of God should be sung perpetually day and night, the singers succeeding each other without interruption³; as if the Supreme Being took pleasure in clamour and noise, and in the flatteries of men. The magnificence of the temples had no bounds⁴. Splendid images were placed in them; among which, after the Nestorian contests, a figure of *St. Mary* holding the infant in her arms, occupied the most conspicuous position. Altars, and coffers in which relics were kept, made

¹ [Holy Thursday. *Tr.*]

² See Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epist.* lib. v. ep. 16; and lib. vi. ep. 1. Martene, *Thesaurus Anecdotor.* tom. v. p. 47. [The three days immediately preceding Ascension-day,—that is, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, it is said, were first observed as days of public fasting, with solemn processions and supplications, by order of Claudius Mamertus, bishop of Vienne, in a time of great public calamity. Whether this was in the year 452, or 463, or 474, writers are not agreed. But the thing met approbation, was imitated, and repeated, till at length it became a law in the Latin church, that these days should be so observed, to secure a blessing on the fruits of the earth, and the temporal interests of men. The three days were called *Rogation Days*, and the week, *Rogation Week*, and the Sunday preceding, *Rogation*

Sunday, from the *Rogations* or *Litanies* chanted in the processions of these days. *Tr.*]

³ Gervais, *Histoire de Suger*, tom. i. p. 23. [This custom probably originated in the East. There, in the beginning of the fifth century, one Alexander established, under the auspices of Gennadius, the patriarch of Constantinople, the Order of *Acemetic*, (*ἀκοιμητοί*), or the *Sleepless*; who so regulated their worship, that it was never interrupted by day or by night; one class of the brethren succeeding another continually. This Order obtained afterwards the name of *Stulites*, from a rich Roman counsellor of the name of *Stadius*, who went to Constantinople, and erected a cloister appropriately for this Order. *Schl.*]

⁴ See an example in Zacharias of Mitylene, de *Officio Mundi*, p. 163, 166.

of solid silver, if possible, were procured in all directions. From this may easily be conjectured what must have been the costliness of the other sacred furniture.

§ 3. On the contrary, the *Agapæ*, or Love-feasts, were abolished; because, as the ancient piety was daily more upon the decrease, they gave to many persons occasions for sin⁵. Among the Latins, offenders of the graver kind, who had before to confess their fault in public, were relieved from this unpleasant duty; for *Leo* the Great gave them liberty to make an acknowledgment of their crimes privately to a priest selected for that purpose. In this way was broken up the ancient discipline, that sole barrier of chastity and modesty, and priests, greatly to their interest, sat in judgment on the actions of mankind⁵.

⁵ [The abolition of the love-feasts was, in part, effected in the fourth century. The council of Laodicea, canon 28, first ordained, that they should no longer be held in the churches. A similar decree was passed, in the year 397, by the third council of Carthage, canon 20 [30]. Yet the custom was too firmly established to be at once rooted out. Hence we find, that in the times of Augustine, love-feasts were still kept in the churches. (Augustine, *contra Faustum*, l. xx. c. 20, 21. *Confess.* l. vi. c. 2. and *Epist.* lxi.) Yet he there informs us, that all kinds of feasting had been excluded from the church by Ambrose. In the Gallic churches, love-feasts were prohibited by the council of Orleans, A. D. 541; and, as here and there some relics of them appeared in the seventh century, the council in *Trullo* [A. D. 692, can. 74] was induced to confirm the canon of the Laodicean council, by annexing the penalty of excommunication. *Schl.*]

⁵ [That the strictness of the ancient discipline was greatly relaxed, admits no question. But that all public testimony against particular offenders, all public penances, and public censures, were commuted for *private* confession before priests, and for *private* penances (as Dr. Mosheim seems to intimate), is contrary to the voice of history. All public offenders, and all such as were *proved* guilty of gross crimes, were still liable to public censures. But the ancient practice of *voluntary* confession, before the church, of *private* offences and *secret* sins, had for some time gone

into desuetude. Instead of such confessions before the church, in most places both of the East and the West, these *voluntary* confessions were made only to a priest, in private; and he directed the persons to such a course as he deemed proper. In some churches, however, in Campania and the vicinity, the practice was for the priests to write down these voluntary disclosures; and if the persons were directed to do penance, their confessions were also read in public. It was to correct this public disclosure of *voluntary* confessions, that *Leo* I. in the year 460, wrote the Epistle to the bishops of Campania, Picenum, and Samnium, to which Dr. Mosheim refers. See his works, *Epist.* 130, or in some editions, ep. 80. It is cited also in Baronius, *Annales*, ann. 459, *sub finem*. The following is a literal translation. "We also decide, that it is every way proper to rescind the practice, so contrary to the apostolic rule, which I learn has been lately followed by some. Let not written statements concerning the nature of the particular sins, be any longer rehearsed in public; since it is sufficient to disclose the accusations of the conscience to the priests, by a private confession. For although that abundance of faith may seem commendable, which, from reverence of God, does not hesitate to take shame before men, yet, as the sins of all are not of such a nature that the penitents have no fear to publish them, let this censurable practice be abolished; lest many should be kept back from doing penance, because they are either ashamed

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS SCHISMS AND HERESIES.

§ 1, 2, 3. Old heresies remaining. The Donatists.—§ 4. State of the Arians.—§ 5. Origin of the Nestorian sect.—§ 6, 7. The occasion of it.—§ 8. The council of Ephesus.—§ 9. Opinion respecting this controversy.—§ 10. Progress of Nestorianism after this council.—§ 11, 12. Its propagator, Barsumas.—§ 13. Eutychian sect.—§ 14. The council called *Conventus Latronum*.—§ 15. Council of Chalcedon.—§ 16. Subsequent contests.—§ 17. In Syria and Armenia.—§ 18. Troubles occasioned by Peter the fuller. Theopaschites.—§ 19. The *Henoticon* of Zeno.—§ 20. produces new contests among the Eutychians.—§ 21. among the defenders of the council of Chalcedon.—§ 22. The doctrines of Eutyches and the Monophysites.—§ 23. The Pelagian controversy.—§ 24. Its progress.—§ 25. The Predestinarians.—§ 26. The Semi-Pelagians.—§ 27. Various controversies concerning grace.

§ 1. SOME of the sects of the preceding times having acquired accessions to their strength, now disquieted the church. I will pass in silence those inauspicious names of former days, the *Novatians*, the *Marcionites*, and *Manichæans*, notwithstanding a numerous progeny of them appeared here and there, and will confine my remarks to those two pests of the preceding century, the *Donatists* and the *Arians*.

The *Donatists* had hitherto enjoyed tolerable prosperity. But near the commencement of this century, the catholic bishops of Africa, led on principally by St. *Augustine*, of Hippo, put forth all their energies to crush and destroy this sect; which was not only very troublesome to the church, but through the *Circumcelliones*, who were its soldiers, pernicious also to the commonwealth. Accordingly, in the year 404, the council of

or afraid to disclose their deeds before their enemies, by whom they may be troubled with processes of law. For that confession is sufficient which is made first to God, and then also to the priest, whose business it is to pray over the sins of the penitents. For then more

persons can be induced to do penance, if the [private] consciousness of the confessing person is not published in the ears of the people."—See also Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, Leo I. vol. ii. p. 124, &c. ed. Lond. 1750. Tr.]

Carthage sent deputies to the emperor *Honorius*, petitioning that the imperial laws against heretics might be so extended as to embrace explicitly the Donatists, who denied that they were *heretics*; and also, that the fury of the *Circumcelliones* might be restrained¹. The emperor, therefore, first imposed a fine upon all *Donatists* who should refuse to return to the church, and ordered their bishops and teachers to be banished². The following year, additional and more severe laws were enacted against all Donatists, which were usually called *Edicts of Unity*³. And as the magistrates were, perhaps, somewhat remiss in executing these laws, a council of Carthage, in the year 407, by means of another deputation to the emperor, both requested and obtained special executors of these *Edicts of Unity*⁴.

§ 2. The weakened party recovered strength and courage in the year 408, when *Silicho* was put to death by order of *Honorius*⁵; and still more, in the year 409, when *Honorius* issued a law that no one should be compelled in matters of religion⁶. But a council convened at Carthage, in the year 410, again sent a deputation to the emperor, and obtained a repeal of this law⁷; and likewise the appointment of *Marcellinus*, a tribune, and a notary⁸, to visit Africa, in the year 411, with full power to bring this long and pernicious controversy to a conclusion. Accordingly, *Marcellinus*, about the feast of Easter, A.D. 411, in that solemn trial which is called a *conference*⁹, formally examined the cause, and after a three days' hearing of

¹ [The documents of this transaction may be found in Mansi, *Collectio Concilior. Ampliss.* tom. iii. p. 1157, and in Harduin's Collection, tom. i. in *Cod. Eccles. African.* can. 92, &c. p. 915, &c. and in Du Pin, *Monument. Vet. ad Donatist. Histor. Pertinent.* p. 216. Compare also Augustine, *Ep.* 93, and, among the moderns, Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzer-eyen*, vol. iv. p. 192, &c. *Schl.*]

² [Even before the arrival of the deputies from the council, the emperor had determined vigorously to persecute the Donatists, and to compel them to a union with their opposers, and had issued a law, by which the refractory bishops and clergy were to be banished, and the laity to be fined. The character of this law may be learned from Augustine, *Epist.* 185, § 25, &c. and *Epist.* 83, § 7. The law itself is probably lost. The edict which was issued after the petition of the council, is in the *Codex*

Theodos. de Hæret. l. 38. *Schl.*]

³ [These *Edicts of Uniformity* are mentioned in the *Codex Theodos.* l. 2. *de religione*; and in the Decree of the council of Carthage A.D. 407, in *Cod. Eccles. African.* can. 99, and by Du Pin, p. 220. Godofroi and Tillemont suppose the before-mentioned law, (l. 38, *de Hæret.*) and l. 3. *de Bapt. Iterand.* were included among them. *Schl.*]

⁴ [The documents are found in Du Pin, and the laws in the *Codex Theodos.* l. 41 and 43 *de Hæret.* *Schl.*]

⁵ [See Augustine, *Ep.* 97, § 2, &c. ep. 100, § 2, ep. 105, § 6. *Schl.*]

⁶ [This law is in the *Codex Theodos.* l. 50, *de Hæret.* and in Du Pin, *Monument.* p. 224. *Schl.*]

⁷ [See Noris, *Historia Donatistor.* p. 533. *Schl.*]

⁸ [Or imperial secretary. *Tr.*]

⁹ [Collatio. *Ed.*]

the parties, gave sentence in favour of the *Catholics*¹. At this court 286 Catholic bishops, and 279 Donatist bishops, were present. The vanquished Donatists then appealed to the emperor; but in vain. The principal actor in all these scenes was *Augustine*, that most celebrated man, who, by his writings, counsels, and admonitions, ruled nearly all the church of Africa, and her leading men².

§ 3. By the conference at Carthage, the Donatist party lost a large part of its strength; nor could it ever recover from the shock, although favoured by changes of affairs. Very many, through fear of punishment, submitted to the will of the emperor, and returned to the church. On the contumacious, the severest penalties were inflicted, such as fines, banishment, confiscation of goods, and even death upon the more obstinate and seditious³. Some escaped these penalties by flight, others

¹ See Fran. Baldwin, (who, was a lawyer,) *Historia Collationis Carthag.* subjoined to *Optatus Mileritanus*, ed. Du Pin, p. 337.—This meeting, called by Marcellinus, is improperly denominated a *conference*, or a free discussion; for the Donatists and Catholics did not enter into a disputation, in which each party endeavoured to vanquish the other by arguments. It was truly and properly a *legal trial*, in which Marcellinus, as the judge of this ecclesiastical cause appointed by the emperor, after a three days' hearing of the parties, pronounced sentence authoritatively. It appears, therefore, that no one, then, once thought of any *supreme judge* in the church, appointed by Christ. These bishops of Africa made application solely to the emperor in this contest. —[For an account of this *Conference*, the reader may consult with advantage Dr. Waleh's *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv. p. 198, &c. As to the sources of knowledge concerning it, see the *Gesta Collationis Carthaginæ Habita*, published in Du Pin's *Monument. Vet. ad Hist. Donatist.* p. 225, &c. and in Harduin's *Collectio Concil.* tom. i. p. 1043, &c. also *Augustine, Breuiol. Collationis cum Donatistis*, in his *Opp.* tom. ix. p. 371, &c. *Schl.*]

² [His writings against the Donatists fill the whole ninth volume of his works, according to the Amsterdam impression of the Benedictine edition. His recommendations, in the Donatist contest, were not always the best. In his Epis-

cles to Vincentius and to Boniface, he speaks in such a manner about punishing heretics, that he must be regarded as the man whose writings afforded most support to that spirit of persecution which, laid waste the church in after-ages more than in his own times. In the contests with the Donatists, he seemed often to show himself on the side of those who would pursue mild measures; for he himself made representations to the imperial court against punishing the Donatists with death. Yet these representations are founded, not on correct views respecting toleration, but on the current principle that it is unseemly for Christians to bear a part in the execution of criminals. *Schl.*]

³ [By virtue of the law, (*Codex Theodos. de Hæreticis*, l. 52,) all Donatists, without distinction, and their married women, if they would not unite with the orthodox, were to be fined, according to the wealth of each individual. Such as would not be reclaimed by this means, were to forfeit all their goods; and such as protected them, were liable to the same penalties. Servants and country tenants were to undergo corporal punishments by their masters and lords, or on the other hand suffer the same pecuniary mulcts. The bishops and all the clergy were to be banished to different places, yet always beyond the province; and all Donatist churches were transferred to the opposite party. *Schl.*]

by concealment, and some by a voluntary death; for the Donatists were very prone to self-destruction. The *Circumcelliones*, wandering over Africa, and raging every where, escaped by dint of arms and violence. Their former liberties and repose were restored to the Donatists by the Vandals, who, under *Genseric*, invaded Africa in the year 427, and wrested this province from the Romans. But the edicts of the emperors had inflicted such a wound upon this sect, that, though renovated and augmented under the Vandals, it never could regain its former numbers⁴.

§ 4. The Arians, oppressed and persecuted by the imperial edicts, took refuge among those barbarous nations who gradually overturned the Roman empire in the West, and found among the Goths, Heruli, Suevi, Vandals, and Burgundians, a fixed residence and a quiet retreat. Being now safe, they treated the Catholics with the same violence that the Catholics had employed against them and other heretics, and had no hesitation about persecuting the adherents to the Nicene doctrines in a variety of ways. The Vandals, who had established their kingdom in Africa, surpassed all the rest in cruelty and injustice. At first *Genseric* their king, and then *Huneric* his son, demolished the temples of such Christians as maintained the divinity of the Saviour, sent their bishops into exile, mutilated many of the more firm and decided, and tortured them in various ways⁵. And they expressly stated, that they were authorized to do so by the example of the emperors, who had enacted similar laws against the Donatists in Africa, the Arians, and others who dissented from them in religion⁶. During this African persecution, God himself is said to have confuted the Arians by a great miracle, causing by his almighty power the persons, whose tongues had been cut out by order of the tyrants, to speak distinctly notwithstanding, and to proclaim the praises and majesty of *Christ*. The fact itself no one can well deny, for it rests on powerful testimony: but whether there was any thing supernatural in it, may be questioned⁷.

⁴ [See Witsius, *Histor. Donatist.* c. viii. § 9. *Schl.*]

⁵ See Victor Vitensis, *de Persecutione Vandalica* libri iii.; published by Theo. Ruinart, in connexion with his own *Historia Persecutionis Vandal.* Paris, 1698, 8vo, [and reprinted, Venice, 1732.]

⁶ See the edict of king Huneric, in Victor Vitensis, lib. iv. c. ii. p. 64, where much is said on this subject.

⁷ See Ruinart, *Historia Persecut. Vandal.* pt. ii. c. 7, p. 482, &c. and the recent and acute discussions of some Englishmen, respecting this miracle. *Bibliothèque Britannique*, tom. iii. pt. ii.

§ 5. A new sect, which was the source of lamentable evils to the church, was formed by *Nestorius*, a Syrian by birth, bishop

p. 339, &c. tom. v. pt. i. p. 171, &c. [Dr. Maclaine has here a long note, in review of the discussions respecting this alleged miracle, by Abadie, Beriman, Chapman, and Dodwell, who defend the miracle; and by an anonymous writer, and Middleton, and Toll, who controvert it. The discussion turned on four points, 1. the credibility of the testimony; 2. the degree in which the men were mutilated; 3. the possibility of speaking with imperfect, and even with no tongues; and 4, the probability that God would work a miracle to decide such a theological dispute.—Schlegel's note is more historical, and, though long, may be worth inserting entire. Humeric, (he says,) in the beginning of his reign, was very indulgent to the orthodox, and at the request of the emperor Zeno, allowed them to choose a bishop of Carthage, on condition that the Arian churches in the Roman empire should be allowed the same privilege. The orthodox did actually choose Eugenius for their bishop. (Victor Vitens. *de Persent. Vandal.* lib. ii. cap. 7.) But by the instigation of the Arian bishops, Humeric afterwards changed his course. He forbade any person, in a Vandal dress, attending the orthodox worship; and dismissed such of them as were in his service, and condemned them to labour in the fields. In the year 483, he banished to the deserts a great number of their teachers, with their adherents, on pretence of a violation of the royal statutes. In the year 484, in February, a formal conference of both parties was appointed, when the orthodox handed in a long confession of their faith, but without gaining a hearing from the Vandal patriarch, Cyrila. After this, Humeric forbade by a severe law all public worship among the orthodox; ordered their books to be burned; caused the 466 bishops, who had been called to Carthage, to be arrested and banished to different countries; and endeavoured to compel all his subjects to become Arians. Many confessors then endured the most distressing sufferings, and a great number of them were cruelly put to death. At Typasus in Mauritania, most of the inhabitants fled to Spain, because Cyrila determined to force upon them an Arian

bishop. Such as stayed behind refused to accept the bishop, and kept up their own separate worship. Humeric therefore caused their tongues to be cut out by the roots, and their right hands to be chopped off. They were able, notwithstanding, to speak distinctly. Victor expresses himself with so much assurance on this subject, that he says, whoever doubts the fact, need only go to Constantinople, where he will now meet with a sub-deacon, named Reparatus, who, although his tongue was cut out, nevertheless speaks without any effort, clearly and distinctly, and is on that account in high esteem in the court of the emperor Zeno, and especially with the empress. Theodas of Gaza, a Platonic philosopher, who then lived at Constantinople, and was an eye-witness, (in his Dialogue on the Resurrection, entitled *Theophrastus*, p. 81,) says he had himself seen these people, and had heard them, to his amazement, speak distinctly; that he would not trust his ears, but ascertained the fact by ocular proof; that he made them open their mouths, and then found that their tongues were cut out at the roots. Procopius testifies, that many of those whose tongues had been cut out, were living at Constantinople in his times, and that they spoke very distinctly. The count Marcellinus, who was chancellor to Justinian, and compiled his Chronicle from the records of the judicial courts, says: *se vidisse mutum quendam, ita mutum, post abscissam linguam statim locutum, refutasse Arianorum hæresin et de fide Christiana veras voces emisisse.* Isidorus, in his Chronicle, testifies also to the fact; as does Evagrius, in his *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. c. 14. See Valesius on these passages; and Saggiarius, *de Cruciat. Martyr.* p. 296, and Joh. de Schmidt, *Diss. de Elinguatis Mysteriorum Trinitatis Prædicantibus*, in his *Decas Dissert.* Hist. Theol. No. 7. Even Justinian himself (*Code Justin.* lib. i. tit. 27, *de Officio Præfeti Prætorio Africa*) says: "We have seen venerable men, with their tongues cut out from the roots, lamentably describing their sufferings." One must therefore carry historical scepticism quite too far, if he would question the reality of the fact. But whether it be not possible, that a man should speak distinctly without a

of Constantinople, a pupil of the celebrated *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, a man of eloquence, and not without learning, but arrogant and indiscreet. That *Christ* was truly God, and at the same time truly man, had been placed beyond all controversy by the decrees of former councils: but as to the *mode* and the *effects* of the union of these two natures in *Christ*, hitherto there had been no discussion among Christians, and nothing had been decided by the councils. The Christian doctors were therefore accustomed to express themselves differently respecting this mystery. Some used expressions which seemed to separate between the Son of God and the Son of man too far, and to make out *two persons* in *Christ*. Others seemed to confound the Son of God with the Son of man, and to make both natures in *Christ* coalesce, and constitute but *one person*. The Syrian and oriental doctors differed, in this matter, from those of Alexandria and Egypt, after the rise of the sect of *Apollinaris*; for he taught that the man *Christ* was without a proper human soul, and that the divine nature in *Christ* supplied the place of a rational soul; whence arose a confusion of natures. The Syrians, therefore, to distinguish themselves from the followers of *Apollinaris*, carefully distinguished the *man* from the *God* in *Christ*, and used phraseology which might lead to the supposition, that they divided the person of *Christ* into *two persons*. On the contrary, the Alexandrians and the Egyptians were accustomed to adopt modes of expression which might be charged with favouring Apollinarianism, and which seemed to imply a confusion of the two natures. *Nestorius* being bred in

tongue, and also whether that, which took place in Africa during the persecution, was a real miracle, or not, are more properly physical than historical questions. *Tr.*—The number of the mutilated parties is not mentioned by any contemporary, but an old menology makes it sixty. Evagrius merely says, that Huneric inflicted this cruelty upon *some* (ἐπί τινος δὲ τὰς γλώσσας ἀφίδετο). He does no more, too, than cite Procopius for the relation, and that writer only professes to have seen the sufferers at Constantinople, a convenient distance from the scene of the alleged miracle. Two of them, he adds, lost this miraculous power of speech, *because they chose to have connexion with women* (γυναιξὶν ὁμιλεῖν ἐβουλήθησαν); in other words,

because they left the party which extolled an ascetic continence. After this, the grace of martyrdom stayed no longer with them (τοῦ μαρτυρίου τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῖν μὴ ἐτί παραμείναισιν). The occasion of this loss is sometimes represented as connexion with abandoned women; but Evagrius may be understood as meaning no more than that the two men married. This would at once destroy their credit with people insisting upon the merit of celibacy; and sounds which had been lately pronounced quite articulate, would soon be described, in such quarters, as the very reverse. Upon the whole, this alleged miracle seems scarcely to deserve the notice that has, at various times, been taken of it. *Ed.]*

the Syrian schools, and extremely anxious for the extermination of all the sects, and especially that of the Apollinarists, discoursed of the two natures in *Christ*, after the manner of his instructors, and directed his hearers to make a distinction between the Son of God and the Son of man, and carefully to discriminate the actions and sensations of the one from those of the other⁶.

§ 6. The occasion for this controversy was given by *Anastadius*, a presbyter and the intimate friend of *Nestorius*. This presbyter, in a public discourse delivered A. D. 428, opposed the use of the word *Θεοτόκος*, or *mother of God*, which was now more frequently applied to the mother of *Christ*, in discussions with the Arians, than formerly, and to which the Apollinarists were exceedingly attached; alleging, that the holy virgin could only be called *χριστοτόκος*, *mother of Christ*; because *God* could neither be born nor die, and that only the *Son of man* was born of *Mary*. *Nestorius* approved this discourse of his friend, and in several addresses explained and defended it⁷. Some monks at Constantinople made opposition, maintaining that the son of *Mary* was *God incarnate*; and they endeavoured to stir up the people against *Nestorius*. But most persons were pleased with his discourses; and when they were carried to the monks of Egypt, these were so moved by his arguments, that they embraced his opinions, and ceased to denominate *Mary* the *mother of God*¹.

⁶ A *History of Nestorianism* was written in French by the Jesuit, Ludov. Doucin, Paris, 1716, 4to. But it is such a one as might be expected from a person who was obliged to rank Cyril among the saints, and Nestorius among the heretics. [A better account is given by C. W. F. Walch, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v. p. 289, &c. to the end of the volume.] The ancient writers, on both sides, are mentioned by J. F. Buddens, *Isayoge in Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 1084, &c. In what manner the oriental writers relate the matter, is stated by Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 103, and by Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Bibliotheca Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. iii. pt. ii. p. lxxvii. &c. [For the sources of knowledge, and a list of the writers, on this controversy, see Walch, loc. cit. p. 304, &c.—For testimony to the persecuting spirit of Nestorius, see Soerates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vii. c. 29, where we

are told, that on the very day of his installation, he thus publicly addressed the emperor: "Give me a country purged of heretics, and I will recompense you with heaven; aid me to conquer the heretics, and I will aid you to conquer the Persians." And five days after, he commenced his work, by demolishing the Arian house of worship, and proceeded to persecute the Novatians, the Quartodecimani, and the Macedonians. He was undoubtedly a rash zealot, yet a person of some talents, sincere, and by no means inclined to be a heresiarch. See a general account of him, in note 7, p. 439, above. *Tr.*]

⁷ See these discourses of Nestorius, in the works of Marius Mercator, tom. ii. p. 5, &c. accompanied with the observations of Joh. Garnier. [See also Soerates, *Hist. Eccles.* l. vii. c. 32. *Tr.*]

¹ [Cyril, against Nestorius, lib. i. and in his Epistle to the monks, to Nestorius,

§ 7. *Cyril*, a man of a most restless and arrogant spirit, was then bishop of Alexandria, and of course jealous of the increasing power and authority of the Constantinopolitan prelate. On hearing of this controversy, he at once blamed both his monks and *Nestorius*. But as the latter would not retract, *Cyril*, after advising with *Cælestine*, the bishop of Rome, resolved on war; and calling a council at Alexandria A. D. 430, he hurled twelve *anathemas* at the head of *Nestorius*, who, finding himself accused of blasphemy against *Christ*, returned as many *anathemas* against *Cyril*, accusing him of the same crime, and of Apollinarianism, and of confounding the two natures of *Christ*². This contest between two bishops of the

and to *Cælestine*. *Schl.*—The incessant use of this party-term in the Church of Rome has produced very serious evils, ignorant and superstitious minds being confirmed by it in a propensity to deify the Virgin Mary. Thus, not only have Christian principles been undermined, but also a tinsel glare has lowered the majesty of public worship. *Ed.*]

² See Joh. Harduin, *Concilia*, tom. i. p. 2199. Other *anathemas*, different from the published ones, are set forth by Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 199, &c.—[A more circumstantial account of the events touched on in this section, drawn from Dr. Walsh, is contained in the following note of Von Einem. The Epistle of Cyril to the Egyptian monks, was brought to Constantinople: and it justly gave offence to *Nestorius* and his friends; for Cyril might at least have sought a friendly correspondence with *Nestorius*. The epistle was refuted by *Nestorius*. Cyril then wrote to *Nestorius*; who answered him shortly, and gave him to understand, that he had as little inclination for a controversy, as to have Cyril for a judge in this matter. Dorotheus, bishop of Marcianople, was so indiscreet as to anathematize publicly in the church, the doctrine that Mary was the *mother of God*; and this inflamed Cyril the more, as he supposed the opposite party meant to anathematize him. In the mean time, Cyril was accused by some Alexandrians at Constantinople, of various offences, the nature and grounds of which are not known. Cyril therefore became suspicious of *Nestorius*, and his conduct towards him was offensive. Both prelates now wrote to each other, using se-

vere language. Cyril also sent prolix statements to the emperor, and to the princesses Pulchéria, Arcadia, and Marínia: which thing, however, was not relished by the emperor, who supposed Cyril aimed to produce disagreement in the emperor's family. The contest now reached *Cælestine*, bishop of Rome. *Nestorius* wrote to him first; and although on another matter, yet he gave him a full account of the disturbances at Constantinople, but without even mentioning Cyril. He also sent his discourses. But as *Cælestine* did not understand Greek, (a poor commendation of a bishop of Rome!) the discourses were laid by unread, and the letter was not answered. *Nestorius* repeated his letters, but without mentioning Cyril, or attempting to prejudice *Cælestine* against him. Cyril, however, fearing such a thing, sent Possidonius to Rome, with the writings of *Nestorius*, and his correspondence with him, translated into Latin; and invited *Cælestine* to join him against *Nestorius*. *Cælestine* acknowledges that his first acquaintance with the heresy of *Nestorius*, was derived from the statement of Cyril. He held a council at Rome, and made a decree, that *Nestorius* should be deposed, unless he recanted within ten days after receiving his letter. Besides the letters to *Nestorius* and to Cyril, (to the latter of whom he committed the execution of his decree,) he sent a letter to the clergy and people of Constantinople, and a circular letter to the other patriarchs and bishops. Cyril forwarded the circular, accompanying it with additional letters; but the letter to the chief men of Constantinople he kept back.

highest order, which originated rather from the depraved passions of the mind than from a sincere love of truth, was the parent and the cause of immense evils.

§ 8. The feelings of the parties being so exasperated by their reciprocal excommunications and letters, that there was no prospect of an amicable termination to the controversy, the emperor, *Theodosius II.*, assembled a council at Ephesus, in the year 431, which is accounted the *third general council*. *Cyril*, the adversary of *Nestorius*, presided; and he wished to have the cause examined and decided, before *John*, the bishop of Antioch, and the other bishops of the East, should arrive. *Nestorius* maintained, that both circumstances were contrary to equity; and, therefore, when summoned to trial, he refused to appear. But *Cyril*, pressing the business forward, without a hearing of the cause, and a great part of the bishops being absent, *Nestorius*, whom the council compare with *Judas* the betrayer of the Saviour, was condemned as guilty of blasphemy, deprived of his office, and sent into banishment, where he closed his days³. That base artifices and intrigues had not

John, bishop of Antioch, sent the letter he received from *Cyril* to *Nestorius*; and accompanied it with such observations as were an honour to him, and which made such an impression on *Nestorius*, that he explained himself well in public discourses, and merely rejected the *erroneous meaning* of the phrase, *mother of God*. Whether *Cyril* was made acquainted with the change in the circumstances of the case, is not known. He now called a council at Alexandria, in which a letter was drawn up addressed to *Nestorius*, and also twelve condemnatory propositions for him to subscribe, as the formula of his retraction. A letter was also directed to the officers and members of the church at Constantinople, exhorting them to rise against their patriarch. A third letter was addressed to the monks. Four bishops were appointed to deliver to *Nestorius* the letter of the council, and also the still retained letter of *Cælestine* to him. He did not speak with these delegated bishops, nor comply with the demands of the letters; but his public discourses became more embittered. The retaliatory anathemas, which he now published, were undoubtedly designed to bring *Cyril* under suspicion, as holding erroneous opinions

concerning the person of Christ. *John* of Antioch, and many oriental bishops with him, actually judged the propositions of *Cyril* to be erroneous. *Nestorius*, on the contrary, was declared by *John* to have explained himself in an orthodox manner. In the mean time, *Nestorius* was proceeding with zeal, and excommunicated many persons.—See Dr. *Walch's Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. v. p. 700, &c. *Von Ein.*]

³ Concerning this council, the principal work to be consulted is the *Variorum Patrum Epistolæ ad Concilium Ephesium pertinentes*, which *Chr. Lupus* published from some MSS. at Cassino and in the Vatican, Louvain, 1682, 4to. *Nestorius* was transported to Petra in Arabia, then to Oasis, a desert place in Egypt, where he probably died in the year 435, [or rather, after A.D. 439.] The accounts of his lamentable death, given by *Evagrius*, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. i. c. 7; and by *Theodorus Lector*, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ii. p. 565, are undoubtedly fables deserving no credit.—[On the council of Ephesus, see Dr. *Walch, Historie der Kirchenscheidend.* p. 275, &c.; and *Histories der Ketzeren*, vol. v. p. 452, &c.; from which the following account is taken.—The emperor

a little weight in this council, and that *Cyrl* was influenced more by his passions than by justice and piety, no wise and

called the council; Nestorius was one of the first that arrived. With him came two imperial ministers of state, one of whom was accompanied by soldiers, to protect the council, and was commanded by the emperor to remain with the council. *Cyrl* of Alexandria appeared also, attended by a number of Egyptian bishops, who, with Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, were of his party. From the western provinces appeared only three deputies from the see of Rome, and one deacon deputed by the bishop of Carthage. *Cyrl* presided, though a party. Nestorius, with the imperial commissioners, made the reasonable request that the opening of the council might be deferred, till the arrival of John of Antioch and the other eastern bishops, and also of the Italian and Sicilian members. But neither prayers, nor tears, nor commands in the name of the emperor, could move the fiery *Cyrl* to delay; although it was affirmed that John and the other eastern bishops were within five days' travel of Ephesus. The council was opened June 22. The imperial commissioner gave his public protest against the proceeding, and then retired. Nestorius was cited three times to appear; but he refused to stand before a court so illegally sitting, and from which he had so little reason to expect justice. He was, therefore, on the same day, pronounced a heretic by an irregular outcry. The condemnation was not founded on the Holy Scriptures, but on the writings of the fathers. The next day the decision was communicated to Nestorius; and an account of it was sent to Constantinople, with a letter recommending the immediate choice of a new bishop. Candidianus, the imperial commissioner, and Nestorius transmitted an account of the whole procedure to the emperor; and the former endeavoured, though in vain, to arrest the irregular proceedings at Ephesus. The arrival of John and the eastern bishops, on the 27th of June, made the state of things worse, rather than better. They were offended with the council for not waiting for their arrival; and united themselves with a considerable part of the council who opposed the violent measures against Nestorius, and who accused *Cyrl* of many errors. Whether the two

parties had afterwards any communication with each other is uncertain. John presided over the dissenting party, who met in the house where he lodged; and who, in their precipitancy, declared *Cyrl* and Memnon to be deposed, and to be banished. From this time there were two councils sitting at Ephesus, the one under *Cyrl*, and the other under John, as the presidents. The latter was supported by the imperial commissioner. But both committed such extravagances, as show that the spirit of meekness did not rest upon these fathers. These intemperate proceedings threatened to kindle a flame in the church, and even to disturb the public peace. The emperor, therefore, thought it necessary to bring the matter before his court, and to proceed rather upon principles of good policy than of strict justice. He confirmed the decisions of both parties against each other, in regard to Nestorius, *Cyrl*, and Memnon; and sent another of his ministers to Ephesus, to expel these three bishops from the city, and to admonish the others to unite and act together. In the mean time the bishops of *Cyrl*'s party had held no less than six sessions; in the first three of which, the arrival and formal accession of the delegates from Rome, to all the proceedings of *Cyrl* against Nestorius, and the making out of an account of this, to be sent to the emperor, were the principal transactions. The three subsequent sessions tended farther to widen the breach, as the eastern bishops were publicly excommunicated by the party of *Cyrl*, and a new confession of faith was framed by them. The imperial minister now arrived, and put *Cyrl* and Memnon under arrest; but he laboured in vain to unite the fiercely contending parties. Both concluded to send their respective deputies to the court, which was then at Chalcædon. Historians tell us, the court people were friendly to Nestorius. If so, it will be difficult to assign the cause of the unexpected revocation by the emperor of his former decree, which deprived *Cyrl* and Memnon of their offices, while he still condemned Nestorius to banishment. The party of *Cyrl*, indeed, when they found things not proceeding according to their wishes at Ephesus, made every effort to meet the investigation of

good man will readily deny; but the doctrine which was established in it, that *Christ* consists of *one divine person*, yet of *two natures* most closely united, but *not mixed and confounded*, has been approved and acknowledged by the great body of Christians.

§ 9. To pass by the minor errors which were attributed to *Nestorius*, he is said to have divided *Christ* into two persons; and to have held, that the divine nature joined itself to the full formed man, and only aided him during his life. But *Nestorius* himself, as long as he lived, professed himself utterly opposed to such sentiments⁴. Nor were such sentiments ever directly stated by him, but only inferred by his adversaries, from his rejection of the epithet *mother of God*, and from some incautious and ambiguous terms which he used. Hence, very many both among the ancients and the moderns think, that he held the same sentiments that the Ephesine fathers did, though he expressed himself in a different manner; and they cast the whole blame of this most unfortunate contest upon the restless spirit of *Cyril*, and his malignant disposition towards *Nestorius*⁵. Allowing these to judge correctly, still *Nestorius* must

the case before the imperial court. And their movements were not unsuccessful. The outcry of the more worthless clergy and the monks against *Nestorius*, may have made considerable impression, producing fear of an insurrection, if *Cyril* were punished. Besides, *Nestorius* fell under the displeasure of *Pulcheria*, the emperor's sister, who had vast influence over him. And *Cyril* co-operated by means, — always very efficacious in courts, — the bribery of the ministers. It is strange that the subsequent ages should have regarded the Ephesine assembly as ranking among councils of the highest order; since, in regard to the principal points, it decided nothing happily, and what *was* done, was in reality done by the emperor. — Schlegel's abridgment of *Walch*, corrected by the original. *Tr.*]

⁴ See *Marius Meræator*, *Opp.* tom. ii. p. 236, ed. *Garnier*; and fragments of the Epistles of *Nestorius*, written a little before his death, in *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 40, 41.

⁵ Among the moderns, *Luther* first held such sentiments, and inveighed bitterly against *Cyril*; *de Conciliis*, in his *Opp.* tom. vii. ed. *Altenb.* p. 265,

266, 273, &c. He was followed by innumerable others; as *Peter Bayle*, *Dictionnaire*, tom. iii. [and iv.] article. *Nestorius* and *Rodon*. *Christ. Aug. Salig*, *de Eutychianismo ante Eutychem*, p. 200. *Otto Fred. Schütz*, *de Vita Chytræi*, lib. ii. § 29. p. 190, 191. *Jo. Voigt*, *Biblioth. Historia Hæresiol.* tom. i. pt. ii. p. 457. *Paul. Fran. Jablonsky*, *Exercit. de Nestorianismo*, Berl. 1720, 8vo. *Thesaurus Epistolicus Crizianus*, tom. i. p. 184, &c. tom. iii. p. 175. *Jordan*, *Vie de St. la Croix*, p. 231, and many others. What may be alleged against *Nestorius*, is carefully collected by *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 210, &c. [*C. W. F. Walch*, (*Historie der Ketzereien*, vol. v. p. 778, &c.) after a careful investigation, states the sentiments of *Nestorius* in the following propositions: 1. The doctrine of three persons in the one divine essence, as stated in the Nicene Creed, is true and certain. 2. In particular, the second Person, the divine Word, is true God, eternally begotten of the Father, and of the same essence with him. 3. Yet *Christ* is not only true God, but likewise a complete man; that is, he had a body, and a rational

be pronounced guilty of two faults : first, that he was disposed, rashly, and with offence to many, to abolish the use of a harm-

soul, just as we have. 4. His body he derived from the Virgin Mary, and in her womb. 5. Nothing therefore is more certain, than that Christ possessed *two natures*, a divine and a human. 6. Yet there are not, on this account, *two persons*, two Sons, two Christs, two Lords ; but he is *one person*, one Christ, one Son, one Lord. 7. There was therefore a union between the perfect God, the *Word*, and the perfect man ; and this union may be expressed by various terms, among which *συνάφεια* [*connexion*] is the best, but *ἕνωσις* [*union*] is not to be rejected. 8. To the question, *What was united ?* Nestorius answered : *God and man*, the divinity and humanity, the *two natures*, or *two substances and hypostases* ; but not *two persons*. 9. This union did not consist in this, that the natures ceased to possess their peculiar properties ; for the essential difference of the two natures remained, without the least change or communion. 10. Yet the union was inseparable, so that the *Word* was never afterwards without the assumed man, nor the man without the *Word*. 11. The union of the two natures commenced with the existence of the human nature, when he was conceived in the womb of his mother. 12. It is therefore correctly said, the *Word* became man, and was made flesh. 13. It is also correctly said, the Son of God took upon him man. 14. It is easy to state what kind of union Nestorius did not admit ; but it cannot be proved that he distinctly believed as bishop John states. 15. To explain the connexion of the two natures of Christ, as united in one person, Nestorius said : The Son of God dwells in the man ; and the flesh is the temple of God. Yet he explained himself by saying, that he did not understand *such an indwelling*, as the indwelling of God in the faithful and in the prophets. 16. Nestorius called the human nature *an instrument*, by which the Son of God worked ; and *a garment*, with which he was clad ; and said, God *carried* and *bare* the man. 17. He also admitted a *communion* or *intercourse* of the two natures. 18. And at the same time held to the so-called *personal properties*. 19. In respect to the *communication* of attributes, Nesto-

rius held that, in the Scriptures, names are used in reference to our Saviour, which indicate the *union* of the two natures, but not one nature as *distinct* from the other ; names, with which we must connect the idea of the *entire Christ* ; e. g. *Immanuel, Christ, Jesus, Son, Only Begotten, Lord*. 20. Nestorius admitted that the Scriptures attribute to Christ both divine and human attributes and acts. And he states this rule for interpreting them : Every attribute and act which the Scriptures ascribe to Christ, must be understood indeed of the *one person*, yet not of *both his natures* ; but the sublime and God-belittling must be referred to the *divine nature*, and the inferior to the *human nature*. 21. In the writings of Nestorius, noticeable passages occur relating to expressions which denote the *participation* or *communication* of attributes, and which are indicative of his real sentiments on the subject. They may be divided into two classes. To the first class belong the expressions by which the properties and changes of the *human nature* are referred to Christ in his *divine nature*, or, (according to the customary phrasology of those times,) to the *Word* that was God. The first expression is that of *being born*. It is undeniable, that Nestorius (though not likewise his friends, a few only excepted,) rejected the use of the term *mother of God* ; as also the expression, *Mary bore the Deity*, or, *what was born of Mary, was God*. Yet it is equally undeniable, that Nestorius did not reject the term *mother of God*, nor indeed the other expressions, utterly and perseveringly, except under the limitation *being so and so understood* ; otherwise he acknowledged and professed the correctness and harmlessness of them. 22. The next expression is, the *sufferings, the death and burial* of Christ. Nestorius did not deny that it was God, or man *in union with God*, i. e. *one Christ*, that was crucified, suffered, died, and was buried. But he did deny that Christ, in so far as he was God, was the subject of these changes ; because he was, in his divine nature, unchangeable, and incapable of suffering and dying. 23. The third expression is *resurrection*. On this, his views were

less term⁶, which had been long current; and, secondly, that he presumed to express and explain, by unsuitable phrases and comparisons, a mystery, which exceeds all human comprehension. If to these faults be added the excessive vanity and impetuosity of the man, it will be difficult to determine which was the principal cause of this great contest, *Cyrl* or *Nestorius*.

§ 10. The council of Ephesus was so far from putting an end to these contentions, that it rather extinguished all hope of the restoration of harmony. *John*, bishop of Antioch, and the other eastern prelates, whose arrival *Cyrl* would not wait for, assembled at Ephesus; and they issued against *Cyrl* and his friend *Memnon*, bishop of Ephesus, as severe a sentence as they had issued against *Nestorius*. Hence arose a violent and troublesome controversy between *Cyrl* and those oriental bishops who were under the guidance of *John* of Antioch. It was, indeed, partially adjusted in the year 433, when *Cyrl* acceded to a formula of faith prescribed by *John*, and rejected

the same as on the preceding. As he had borrowed the word *temple* from John ii. 19, &c. he insisted, that Christ there distinguishes the temple from him who raises it up. Yet this distinction he would understand to imply, not a division of *persons*, but only a difference of *natures*. 24. To the second class belong such as relate to the doctrine of a communication of the properties of the *divine* nature to the *human*. And here *Nestorius* did not deny that the man Christ possessed *divine* properties; but only that he possessed them of himself, and not by virtue of the union. 25. He conceded, that to Christ as to his human nature, the divine names and titles were pertinent; but with the limitation, again, *not of himself*, but on account of the union. 26. He admitted, that to the man Christ, divine worship belonged; but again, *not for his own sake*, but on account of the union. 27. The species of communication of attributes, which our theologians call *apotelesmatic*, (attributing the mediatorial acts of the Redeemer, in his official capacity, either to the complex person; or to either of his natures indiscriminately.) *Nestorius* fully recognized; and it is not true that he regarded the work of redemption as the work solely of the human nature. 28. Hence it follows, that *Nestorius* under-

stood well, and expressed distinctly, the unity of the person of Christ, and also the diversity and union of the two natures, with its consequences; yet that he was always anxious for excluding the use of such expressions, as obscured and rendered undiscernible the distinction of the two natures. Hence, when he spoke of Christ, he preferred using a name expressive of his complex person. Thus he would rather say *χριστοτόκος*, mother of Christ, than say *θεοτόκος*, mother of God; or if the latter could not be avoided, he would add something to qualify it, as *mother of the God-Man*.—Dr. Walch is one who thinks the whole controversy between *Nestorius* and his accusers, was a mere dispute about words and phrases. But Dr. Hofmann, in a dispute at Wittemberg, A.D. 1725, maintained, that the *Nestorian controversy* was not mere *logomachy*. *Seld.*]

⁶ [“The title mother of God, applied to the Virgin Mary, is not perhaps so innocent as Mosheim takes it to be. To the judicious and learned it can present no idea at all, and to the ignorant and unwary it may present the most absurd and monstrous notions. The invention and use of such mysterious terms as have no place in Scripture, are undoubtedly pernicious to true religion.” *Muel.*]

the use of certain suspicious phrases. Yet the commotions produced by this controversy continued long in the East⁷. Thenceforward, no means could prevent the friends and disciples of *Nestorius* from spreading his doctrines through various provinces of the East, and every where gathering churches which rejected the Ephesine decrees⁸. The Persians, in particular, were averse from any reconciliation with *Cyril*, and persevered in maintaining, that *Nestorius* was rashly condemned at Ephesus, and that *Cyril* subverted the distinction between the two natures of *Christ*. The propagation of the Nestorian doctrines was still more successful, after the introduction of those doctrines into the celebrated Persian school which had long flourished at Edessa. For the teachers in this school not only taught Nestorian principles to their pupils, but likewise translated from Greek into Syriac the writings of *Nestorius*, and his master, *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, as well as of *Diodorus* of Tarsus, and spread them throughout Assyria and Persia⁹.

§ 11. The Nestorian faith is indebted to no one of all its friends more than to *Barsumas*, who was ejected from the school of Edessa, with his associates, and created, in the year 435, bishop of Nisibis. From the year 440 to the year 485, he laboured, with incredible assiduity and dexterity, to procure for Nestorianism a permanent establishment in Persia. *Manes*, bishop of Ardaschir, was his principal coadjutor. His measures were so successful, that all the Nestorians in Chaldea, Persia, Assyria, and the neighbouring countries, deservedly reverence this *Barsumas* alone, to this day, as their parent and founder. He persuaded the Persian monarch, *Pherozes*, to expel the Christians who adhered to the opinions of the Greeks, and not only to admit Nestorians in their place, but also to allow them to make the first cities in Persia, Seleucia, and Ctesiphon, their primary see; which their *patriarch*, or *catholic*, occupies even down to our times. He also

⁷ See Christ. Aug. Salig, *de Eutychnismo ante Eutychem*, p. 243, &c. [and Dr. Walch's *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v. p. 619, &c. *Schl.*]

⁸ [The Roman provinces, in which Nestorianism most prevailed, were the two Syrias, the two Cilicias, Bithynia, Moesia, Thessaly, Isauria, and the second Cappadocia. *Tr.*]

⁹ See Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 351, &c. tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 69. From which, with other passages, we should correct the account of the early history of Nestorianism, given by Eus. Renaudot, (*Liturgiarum Oriental.* tom. ii. p. 99, &c.) and by others. See also Theodorus Lecter, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ii. p. 558.

erected the famous school at *Nisibis*, from which issued those who, in this and the following century, carried the Nestorian doctrines into Egypt, Syria, Arabia, India, Tartary, and even to China¹.

§ 12. Before this sect became fully formed and established, there was some difference of opinion in it. Some said, that the manner in which the two natures in *Christ* were combined, was wholly unknown; but others denied any other connexion than that of will, operation, and dignity². But this disagree-

¹ All these transactions are well illustrated by the before mentioned Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican.* tom. iii. pt. ii. p. lxxvii. &c. [The Nestorians are not called by this name in the East, (for they regard their doctrines as apostolic; and they never had any connexion with the person of Nestorius,) but are generally called *Chaldaic Christians*, (because their principal or head church is in the ancient Chaldaea,) and in some part of the East Indies, *St. Thomas' Christians*, because they suppose they received Christianity from the apostle Thomas.—They constitute a large Christian community, which has no connexion with others, have their own forms of worship, their own bishops, and their own ecclesiastical councils. Their church extends through all Asia, and exists partly in the Persian, partly in the Turkish, and partly in the Mogul empires. The patriarch resides in a monastery not far from Mosul, and has a great many bishops under him. The enmity of the Persians, and afterwards of the Mahomedans and Saracens against the Romans, contributed much to further the spread of this sect; for they received all refugees from the Roman empire, and extended full protection to such Christians as were not tolerated in the Roman provinces, and whom of course they could not suspect of any understanding with the Romans. Thus, bishop of Edessa, was one of the greatest defenders of Nestorius among the orientals; and, on that account, his epistle to Marin, the Persian bishop of Ardashir, was rejected by some councils. But the chief persons among them were Barsumas, and his assistant Maanes. After the death of Barsumas, the archbishop of Seleucia, Babacus, became the head of the party; and from this time onward, the patriarchs (*catholici* or *jacelici*) resided at Seleucia, until,

under the caliphs, Bagdat and Mosul were selected for that purpose. This Babacus held a council in the year 499, in which not only the whole Persian church professed itself to belong to the Nestorian community, but regulations were also made, that all bishops and priests must be married, and second marriages of the clergy were not merely permitted, but declared to be necessary. (See Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient.* tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 177.) The Nestorians differ from other Christians in the following particulars: that they will not call Mary the *mother of God*; and wholly reject the expressions *God was crucified*, and *died*; that they admit no *natural and personal*, but only a *friendly, union of the Word, that was God*, (for so they speak,) with the *man Jesus*: that they teach, there are in Christ two natures and two substances, each of which has its own personality: that they reject the council of Ephesus, execrate Cyril, as being a wicked wretch, and venerate Nestorius, and Theodorus of Mopsuestia, as being saints: that they worship no images; and perform their worship, which is very simple, in the Syriac language. Together with *baptism*, which they generally administer on the fortieth day after the birth, and the *Lord's supper*, in which they use leavened bread; they make the *consecration of priests* to be a *sacrament*. They also practise anointing with oil, as a ceremony of worship; and likewise in slight diseases, and even in commencing journeys, as a sort of consecration. See Baumgarten's *Geschichte der Religionspartheyen*, p. 536. *Schl.*]

² Leontius Byzantinus, *adv. Nestorianos et Eutychianos*; in Hen. Canisii *Lectiones Antiquar.* tom. i. 537, and Ja. Basnage, *Prolegom. ad Canisium*, tom. i. cap. ii. p. 19, &c.

ment completely disappeared, from the time when the Nestorian community became duly consolidated. For it was decreed by the synods assembled at Seleucia, that there were in the Saviour of mankind, *two persons*, or ὑποστάσεις, namely, a *divine*, that of the *Word*, and a *human*, that of *Jesus*; yet that both persons constituted but one *Aspect*, or as they (following *Nestorius*) expressed it, one *Barsôpa*, that is πρόσωπον: that this union of the Son of God with the Son of Man took place at the very moment of conception, and would never end; but that it was not a union of natures or persons, but only of will and feeling. *Christ*, therefore, must be carefully distinguished from God, who dwelt in *Christ* as in his temple (as *Nestorius* had said); and that *Mary* should never be called the *mother of God*, but only the *mother of Christ*. They reverence *Nestorius* as a holy man, and worthy of everlasting remembrance; but they maintain, that his doctrine was much more ancient than he, being derived from the earliest ages of the church; and therefore they wish not to be called *Nestorians*. And it appears, in fact, that *Barsumas* and his associates did not inculcate on their followers precisely the doctrines taught by *Nestorius*, but that, in some measure, they polished his imperfect system, enlarged it, and connected with it other doctrines which he never embraced.

§ 13. Many, while careful to shun the fault of *Nestorius*, ran into the opposite extreme. The most noted of these was *Eutyches*, abbot of a certain convent of monks at Constantinople; from whom originated another sect, directly opposite to that of *Nestorius*, but equally troublesome and mischievous to the interests of Christianity; and which, like that, spread with great rapidity throughout the East, and acquired such strength in its progress, that it gave immense trouble both to the Nestorians and to the Greeks, and became a very great community. In the year 448, *Eutyches*, now far advanced in years, in order more effectually to put down *Nestorius*, to whom he was a violent foe, explained the doctrine concerning the person of *Christ*, in the phraseology of the Egyptians; and maintained that there was *only one nature in Christ*, namely, that of the *Word*, who became incarnate³. Hence he was supposed to

³ That Cyril had so expressed himself, and had appealed to the authority of Athanasius, to justify the phraseology,

is beyond controversy. But whether Athanasius actually used such language, is doubtful; for many think the book in

deny the *humanity* of Jesus Christ; and was accused, by *Eusebius* of Doryleum, before a council called by *Flavianus*, perhaps in this very year, at Constantinople. And as *Eutyches* refused to give up his opinions at the bidding of this council, he was cast out of the church, and deprived of his office, but he, not acquiescing in this decree, appealed to a general council of the whole church⁴.

§ 11. The emperor *Theodosius*, therefore, convoked at Ephesus, in the year 449, such a council as *Eutyches* had requested; and placed at the head of it *Dioscorus*, bishop of Alexandria, a man as ambitious and restless as *Cyril*, and hostile to the bishop of Constantinople. In this council, the business was conducted with the same kind of fairness and justice, as by *Cyril* in the council of Ephesus against *Nestorius*. For *Dioscorus*, in whose

which it occurs, was not a production of Athanasius. See Mich. Le Quien, *Diss. ii. in Damascenum*, p. xxxi. &c. and Christ. Aug. Salig, *de Eutychianismo ante Eutychen*, p. 112, &c. That the Syrians used the same phraseology before Eutyches' times, and without offence, is shown by Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 219.—We are yet in want of a solid and accurate history of the Eutychian troubles; which, however, Christ. Aug. Salig left in manuscript. [This has not yet been published: but Dr. Ch. W. Fr. Walch has given a very elaborate and full history of the Eutychian and Monophysite sects, filling the whole sixth, seventh, and eighth volumes of his *Historie der Ketzerreigen*, Lips. 1773, 76—78, 8vo; and M. Schroeckh has treated the subject well, in his *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. xviii. p. 433—636, Lips. 1793, 8vo.—The points in controversy between Eutyches and his friends on the one part, and their antagonists on the other, during the first period of the contest, or till the council of Chalcedon in 451, according to Dr. Walch, (*loc. cit.* vol. vi. p. 611—619,) were in amount as follows:—Both held alike, 1. the perfect correctness of the Nicene Creed; and of course, 2. both held the doctrine of a trinity of persons in the Godhead; 3. that God, the Word, was made flesh; 4. that Christ was truly God and truly man united; and 5. that, after the union of the two natures, he was *one person*. But Eutyches maintained, 6. that the two natures of Christ after the union did not remain *two distinct* natures, but constituted *one nature*;

and therefore, 7. that it was correct to say, Christ was constituted of or *from* two natures; but not that he *existed* in two natures. For 8. the union of the two natures was such that, although neither of them was lost, or was essentially changed, yet together they constituted *one nature*; of which compound nature, and not of either of the original natures alone, must thenceforth be predicated each and every property of both natures. He accordingly denied, 9. that it is correct to say of Christ, that, as to his human nature, he was *ὁμοούσιος* (*of the same nature*) with us. It is to be remembered, that Eutyches was solicitous chiefly to confute Nestorius, who kept the two natures almost entirely distinct, and seemed to deny any other union than that of *purpose* and *co-operation*; and in particular he disliked all phrases which predicated the acts and sufferings of the *human* nature, of the *divine* nature: and to enable him to overturn this error, he so blended the two natures, that they could not afterwards be distinguished. *Tr.*]

⁴ [This was an occasional council, assembled for other purposes, before which Eusebius appeared and accused Eutyches. The council peremptorily required him to give up his opinions; and on his refusal, proceeded at once to excommunicate him. See the Acts of this council, in Harduin's *Collection*, tom. ii. p. 70, &c. See also Walch, *Historie der Ketzerreigen*, vol. vi. p. 103—158. *Tr.*]

church nearly the same things were taught as *Eutyches* had advanced, so artfully managed and controlled the whole of the proceedings, that the doctrine of *one nature incarnate* was triumphant, and *Eutyches* was acquitted of all error. On the contrary, *Flavianus* was severely scourged, and banished to Epipa, a city of Lydia, where he soon after died⁵. The Greeks call this Ephesine council *σύνδοδος ληστρική*, an *Assembly of Robbers*, to signify that every thing was carried in it by fraud and violence. This name, however, would be equally applicable to many councils of this and the subsequent times.

§ 15. But the scene changed soon after. *Flavianus* and his adherents engaged *Leo* the Great, the Roman pontiff, on their side,—a course which was commonly taken in that age by those who were foiled by their enemies,—and also represented to the emperor, that an affair of such magnitude demanded a general council to settle it. *Theodosius*, however, could not be persuaded to grant the request of *Leo*, and call such a council. But on his death, *Marcian*, his successor, summoned a new council at Chalcedon, in the year 451, which is called the *fourth general* council. In this very numerous assembly, the legates of *Leo* the Great (who had already publicly condemned the doctrine of *Eutyches*, in his famous Epistle to *Flavianus*;) were exceedingly active and influential. *Dioscorus*, therefore, was condemned, deposed, and banished to Paphlagonia; the Acts of the Ephesine council were rescinded; the Epistle of *Leo* was received as a rule of faith; *Eutyches*, who had already been divested of his presbyteral dignity and exiled by the emperor, was condemned though absent; and not to mention the other decrees of the council, all Christians were required to

⁵ See Jo. Harduin, *Concilia*, tom. i. p. 82, &c. Liberatus, *Breviarium*, c. xii. p. 76. Leo Magn. *Epist.* xciii. p. 625. Nicephorus, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. xiv. c. 47, p. 550, &c. [Walch, *Historie der Kirchensammlungen*, p. 301, &c. and *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. vi. p. 175—264. Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, (*Leo*) vol. ii. p. 42—43, ed. Lond. 1750, 4to. The aged emperor Theodosius II. was managed by the Eutychians; and therefore he called such a council as would accomplish their wishes. In the council, Eutyches offered a confession of faith, which did not touch the point in debate; and this was accepted, without allowing his accusers to be heard. By

acclamation the doctrine of *two natures* in the incarnate Word was condemned. Dioscorus then proposed to condemn Flavianus and Eusebius. Here opposition was made; and Dioscorus called on the imperial commissioners, who threw open the doors of the church; a band of soldiers and an armed mob rushed in. The terrified bishops no longer resisted. Every member (nearly 449,) signed the decrees. Flavianus was deposed and banished. Eusebius of Doryleum, Theodoret of Cyprus, Domnus of Antioch, and several others, were also deposed. The decisions of this council were ratified by the emperor, and ordered to be every where enforced. *Tr.*]

believe, what most to this day do believe, that in *Jesus Christ* there is but *one person*, yet *two distinct natures* no way confounded or mixed ⁶.

§ 16. This remedy, which was intended to heal the wounds of the church, proved worse than the disease. For a great part of the Oriental and Egyptian doctors, though holding various sentiments in other respects, agreed in a vigorous opposition to this council of Chalcedon, and to the Epistle of *Leo* the Great, which the council had adopted, and contended for *one nature* in *Christ*. Hence arose most deplorable discords, and civil wars almost exceeding credibility. In *Egypt*, the excited populace, after the death of the emperor *Marcian*⁷, murdered *Proterius*, the successor of *Dioscorus*, and appointed in his place *Timotheus Ælurus*, a defender of the doctrine of *one incarnate nature*. And although *Ælurus* was expelled from his office by the emperor *Leo*, yet under the succeeding emperor, *Basiliscus*, he recovered it. After his death⁸, the friends of the council of Chalcedon elected *Timotheus*, surnamed *Salophaciolus*; and the advocates for one nature, chose *Peter Moggus*. This latter, however, was obliged, by the emperor's mandate, to give way. But *Salophaciolus* being dead, in the year 482, *Moggus*, by order of the emperor *Zeno*, and by the influence of *Acacius*, bishop of Constantinople, obtained full possession of the see of

⁶ [See the entire Acts of this council, in all the Collections of Councils; *e. g.* Binnius, and Harduin, tom. ii. p. I, &c. See also Evagrius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. c. 2. 4. Cave, *Historia Litterar.* vol. i. p. 482—487. Waleh, *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 307—314, and *Historie der Ketzerzeigen*, vol. vi. p. 293—489. Bower, *Lives of the Popes*, (Leo I.) vol. ii. p. 59—100, ed. Lond. 1750, 4to. The exposition of faith, in the 5th Action of this council, was designed to guard against both Eutychian and Nestorian errors. After recognizing the Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds, with *Leo's* Letter to *Flavianus*, &c. they say: "Following therefore these holy fathers, we unitedly declare, that one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, is to be acknowledged, as being perfect in his Godhead, and perfect in his humanity; truly God and truly man, with a rational soul and body; of like essence (*ὁμοούσιος*) with the Father, as to his Godhead; and of like essence (*ὁμοούσιος*) with us, as to his manhood;

in all things like us, sin excepted; begotten (*γεννηθεῖς*) of the Father, from all eternity, as to his Godhead; and of Mary, the mother of God (*θεοτόκου*) in these last days, for us and for our salvation, as to his manhood; recognized as one Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten; of two natures, unconfounded, unchangeable, undivided, inseparable (*ἀσπυχῶς, ἀρρήπτως, ἀδιαίρετως, ἀχωρίστως*); the distinction of natures not at all done away by the union; but rather, the peculiarity (*ιδιότης*) of each nature preserved, and combining (*συντρεχούσης*) into one substance (*ὑπόστασιν*); not separated or divided into two persons (*πρόσωπα*); but one Son, Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ: as the prophets before [taught] concerning him: so he, the Lord Jesus Christ, hath taught us, and the creed of the fathers hath transmitted to us." *Tr.*]

⁷ [A. D. 457. *Tr.*]

⁸ [A. D. 476. *Tr.*]

Alexandria; and *John Talaia*, whom the Chalcedonians had elected, was removed⁹.

§ 17. In *Syria*, the abbot *Barsumas*, (a different person from *Barsumas* of Nisibis, who gave stability to the Nestorian sect,) having been condemned by the council of Chalcedon, went about propagating the doctrine of *Eutyches*. He also spread this doctrine among the neighbouring Armenians, about the year 460, by means of his disciple *Samuel*. Yet from the harsher form of the Eutychian doctrine, the Syrians afterwards departed, under the guidance of *Zenaias*, or *Philoxenus*, the bishop of *Mabug*¹, and of the very famous *Peter Gnapheus*, or in Latin form, *the Fuller*². For these men denied, what *Eutyches* is said to have taught, that the human nature of *Christ* was *absorbed* in the divine; and simply inculcated that *Christ* possessed *one nature*, and this a *twofold* or *compound one*. Still, as this doctrine was equally inconsistent with the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, the believers in it most stedfastly rejected that council³.

§ 18. *Peter*, who was surnamed the *Fuller*, because, while a monk, he pursued the trade of a fuller, got possession of the see of Antioch; and although he was often ejected and condemned on account of his opposition to the council of Chalcedon, yet, in the year 482, he obtained a full establishment in it by authority of the emperor *Zeno*, and the influence of *Acacius*, bishop of Constantinople⁴. This man, who was formed to promote discord and controversy, occasioned new contests, and was looked upon as inclined to establish a new sect, which has been called the *Theopaschites*; because, to the very celebrated hymn, called *Trisagius*⁵ by the Greeks, *Holy God, Holy Almighty,*

⁹ See Liberatus, *Breviarium*, cap. 16, 17, 18. Evagrius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ii. c. 3; lib. iii. c. 3. Mich. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. p. 410, &c.

¹ [Or Hierapolis. *Tr.*]

² Fullo.

³ Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vaticana*, tom. ii. p. 1—10, and his *Diss. de Monophysitis*, prefixed to this tome, p. ii. &c. [According to Dr. Walsh, the parties were continually coming nearer together in doctrine, so that the theological dispute was sinking fast into a mere logomachy. But several questions of facts, or acts of the parties, became the subjects of lasting dispute and contention. See Walsh's *Histoire des*

Ketzerereyen, vol. vi. p. 796, &c. 825—832. *Tr.*]

⁴ Hen. Valesius, *Diss. de Petro Faltone et de Synodis adversus eum collectis*, annexed to his *Scriptores Histor. Eccles.* tom. iii. p. 173, &c.

⁵ “[Sanctus Deus, sanctus fortis, sanctus immortalis.” (Orig.) “The hymn *Trisagius*, “ἅγιος ὁ Θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρὸς, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, must not be confounded with the hymn, *Ter-sanctus*, beginning, *Holy, holy, holy*, &c. which was never used at any time, or in any office, except in the solemn thanksgiving preceding consecration.” Palmer's *Antiq. of the Engl. Ritual*, Oxf. 1832, i. 64. *Ed.*]

Holy Eternal, he enjoined upon the eastern churches this addition, *who wast crucified for us*. He undoubtedly made this addition with sectarian views, intending to establish men more firmly in his beloved doctrine, that of but *one nature* in Christ. But his adversaries, especially *Felix* of Rome and others, perverted his meaning; charging him with an intention to teach, that *all the three persons* in the Godhead were crucified: wherefore such as approved this form of the hymn were called *Theopaschites*. The consequence of this dispute was, that the western Christians rejected this form of the hymn, which they understood to refer to the whole Trinity; but the oriental Christians have used it constantly, ever since, without offence, because they refer it to *Christ as one person* in the Trinity⁶.

§ 19. To settle these manifold dissensions, which exceedingly disquieted both church and state, the emperor *Zeno*, in the year 482, by the advice of *Acacius*, the bishop of Constantinople, offered to the contending parties that *formula of concord* which is commonly called his *Henoticon*. This formula repeated and inculcated all that had been decreed in the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, against the Arians, Nestorians, and Eutychians; but made no mention of the council of Chalcedon⁷. For *Zeno* had been led by *Acacius* to

⁶ See Hen. Noris, *de uno ex Trinitate carne passo Liber*, in his *Opp.* tom. iii. Diss. i. c. 3, p. 782. Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 518, &c. tom. ii. p. 36, 180, &c. [and Waleh, *Historie der Ketzererey*, vol. vii. p. 237, &c. 329, 339, &c. *Tr.*]

⁷ Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 14. Liberatus, *Breviarium Histor.* c. 18, [in both of which the *Henoticon* is given. Dr. Mosheim's description of this famous decree is very imperfect. In it the emperor explicitly recognizes the *creed* of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan councils, as the *only* established and allowed *creed* of the church; and declares every person an alien from the true church, who would introduce any other. This *creed*, he says, was received by that council of Ephesus which condemned Nestorius, whom, with Eutyches, the emperor pronounces to be heretics. He also acknowledges the twelve chapters of Cyril of Alexandria to be sound and orthodox; and declares Mary to be the *mother of God*, and Jesus Christ to possess *two natures*, in one of which he was

ὁμοούσιος of like substance with the Father, and in the other, *ὁμοούσιος* with us. Thus he fully recognized the doctrines of the council of Chalcedon, without alluding at all to that body: and affirming, that these doctrines were embraced by all members of the true church, he calls upon all Christians to unite on this sole basis; and "anathematizes every person who has thought, or thinks, otherwise, either now, or at any other time, whether at Chalcedon, or in any other synod whatever; but more especially the aforesaid persons, Nestorius and Eutyches, and such as embrace their sentiments;" and concludes with renewed exhortations to a union on this basis. This formula of union was happily calculated to unite the more considerate of both parties. It required, indeed, some sacrifice of principle on the part of the Monophysites, or at least of their favourite phraseology; but it also required the dominant party to give up the advantage over their foes which they had obtained by the general council of Chalcedon. In

believe, that war was not waged against the *doctrine* of the council of Chalcedon, but only against the council itself. This formula of concord was subscribed by the leaders of the *Monophysite* party, *Peter Moggus*, bishop of Alexandria, and *Peter Fallo*, bishop of Antioch. It was likewise approved by *Acacius* of Constantinople, and by all the more moderate of both parties. But the violent, on either side, stoutly resisted, and complained that this *Henoticon* did injustice to the most holy council of Chalcedon⁸. Hence arose new controversies, as troublesome as those which preceded.

§ 20. A considerable part of the *Monophysites* or *Eutychians* considered *Peter Moggus* to have committed a great crime, by acceding to the *Henoticon*; and, therefore, they united in a new party, which was called that of the *Acephali*, because they were deprived of their head or leader⁹. Afterwards this sect became divided into three parties, the *Anthropomorphites*, the *Bursanophites*, and the *Esaianists*. And these sects were succeeded in the next age by others, of which the ancients make frequent mention¹. Yet the inquirer into the subject must be informed, that some of these Eutychian sects are altogether imaginary; that others differed not in reality, but only in terms; and that some were distinguished, not by their sentiments, but by some external rites and other outward circumstances. And they were all likewise of temporary duration; for, in the next century, they gradually became extinct, chiefly through the influence of *Jacobus Baradaeus*².

Egypt, the *Henoticon* was extensively embraced; but the bishops of Rome were opposed to it, and were able to render it generally inefficient. *Tr.*]

⁸ See Faëmundus Hiermianensis, *Defensio trium Capitulorum*, l. xii. c. 4.

⁹ Evagrius, *Hist. Eccles.* l. iii. c. 13. Leontius Byzant. *de Sectis*, tom. i. *Lectio. Antiquar.* Hen. Canisii, p. 537. Timotheus Presbyter, in Joh. Bapt. Cotelier, *Monument. Ecclesie Græcæ*, tom. iii. p. 409. [From the time of the council of Chalcedon, the Eutychians gradually receded from the peculiar views of Eutyches; and, therefore, discarded the name of Eutychians, and assumed the more appropriate one of Monophysites, which indicated their distinguishing tenet, that the two natures of Christ were so united as to constitute but *one nature*. The whole party,

therefore, having long renounced Eutyches as their leader, when some of them also renounced Peter Moggus, they were indeed *Acephali*, *without a head*. Yet all the branches of this sect continued to bear the name of Monophysites till late in the sixth century, when Jacobus Baradaeus raised them up from extreme depression through persecution, and they assumed the name of Jacobites,—a name which they bear to this day. *Tr.*]

¹ These sects are enumerated by Ja. Basnage, *Prolegom. ad Hen. Canisii Lectiones Antiquas*, cap. iii.; and Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Diss. de Monophysitis*, p. 7, &c.

² [For an account of Jacobus Baradaeus, and his labours in resuscitating the fallen sect of the Monophysites, see Waleh, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. viii. p. 481—491. *Tr.*]

§ 21. The Roman pontiff, *Felix III.*, with his friends, attacked *Acacius*, the bishop of Constantinople, who had favoured the *Henoticon*, as a betrayer of the truth, and excluded him from church communion. To justify this hostility, *Felix* and his successors taxed *Acacius* with favouring the Monophysites, and their leaders, *Peter Moggus* and *Peter Fullo*, with contempt for the council of Chalcedon, and with some other things. But in reality, as many facts demonstrate, *Acacius* became odious to the Roman pontiffs, merely because he denied by his actions the supremacy of the Roman see, and was extremely eager to gain an increase of power and dignity for the bishop of new Rome. The Greeks defended the character and memory of their bishop, against the aspersions of the Romans. This contest was protracted till the following century, when the pertinacity of the Romans triumphed, and caused the names of *Acacius* and *Peter Fullo* to be stricken from the sacred registers, and consigned as it were to perpetual infamy³.

§ 22. The cause of this so great a series of evils, appears to be a very small thing. It is said, that *Eutyches* himself thought the divine nature of Christ to have absorbed his human nature; so that *Christ* consisted of but *one nature*, and that the *divine*. Yet whether this was the fact or not, is not sufficiently clear. This sentiment, however, together with *Eutyches*, was abandoned and rejected by the opposers of the council of Chalcedon, under the guidance of *Xenias* and *Peter Fullo*; and, therefore, they are more properly called *Monophysites* than *Eutychians*. For all who are designated by this name, held that the divine and human natures of *Christ* were so united as to constitute but *one nature*; yet without any conversion, confusion, or commixture: and that this doctrine might not be understood differently from their real meaning, they often said, there is but *one nature* in *Christ*, yet it is *twofold* and *compound*⁴. With *Eutyches* they disclaimed all connexion; but

³ Hen. Valesius, *Diss. de Synodis Romanis*, in quibus damnatus est *Acacius*, subjoined to the third volume of his *Scriptores Histor. Eccles.* p. 179, &c. J. Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 301. 390, 381, &c. *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Crit.* tom. i. art. *Acacius*, p. 75, &c. Dav. Blondell, *de la Primauté dans l'Eglise*, p. 279, &c. *Acta Sancto-rum*, tom. iii. Februarii, p. 502, &c.

[Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, (Felix III.) vol. ii. p. 198, &c. ed. Lond. 1750, 4to. Tr.]

⁴ See the quotations from works of the Monophysites, by that excellent, and at times sufficiently ingenuous writer, Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 25, 26. 29. 34. 117. 133. 135. 277. 297, &c.

they venerate *Dioscorus*, *Barsumas*, *Xenias*, and *Peter Fullo*, as pillars of their sect; and reject the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, together with the epistle of *Leo* the Great. This view of things, if it be estimated by the language used, appears to have differed from the doctrines established at Chalcedon, in the mode of stating them, but not in reality⁵. Yet, if we attend carefully to the metaphysical arguments and subtleties by which it is supported⁶, perhaps we shall conclude, that the Monophysite controversy with the Chalcedonians was not wholly about words.

§ 23. Other troubles invaded the church in this century from the West, and continued down through subsequent ages. *Pelagius*⁷ and *Cælestius*⁸, the former a Briton, and the latter

⁵ Many learned men consider this controversy as a mere strife about words. Among the Monophysites, Gregory Abulpharajus, the most learned of the sect, was of this opinion. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 291. Add the *Biblioth. Indique*, tom. xvii. p. 285. Matur. Veis. la Croze, *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes*, p. 23; and *Hist. du Christ. d'Ethiopie*, p. 14, &c. Even Asseman, (*loc. cit.* p. 297,) though living at Rome, canre near to avowing this opinion.

⁶ See the subtle disputation of Abulpharajus, in Asseman, tom. ii. p. 283.

⁷ [Pelagius, the heresiarch, was probably a Welchman, whose real name, it is said, was Morgan or *Marigant*, which was translated Πηλάγιος, *Pelagius*. He was a British monk, went to Rome about the year 400, imbibed the opinions of Origen, and began to publish his heretical sentiments concerning original sin and free grace, about A. D. 405. In the year 408, when the Goths were laying waste Italy, he and Cælestius retired to Sicily, and, in 411, to Africa. Cælestius remained there, but Pelagius proceeded on to Egypt, to visit the monks of that country. In 415, he removed to Palestine, where he enjoyed the protection of John, bishop of Jerusalem. Orosius (now in the East) impeached him; but he so far purged himself, before the council of Diospolis in 417, as to be acquitted. But the next year he was condemned by the councils of Carthage and Milevi, as well as by the popes, Innocent and Zosimus; and the emperor Honorius ordered him and his adherents to be expelled from Rome. Theodotus of

Antioch now held a council, which condemned him. His subsequent history is unknown.—He was a man of distinguished genius, learning, and sanctity. Yet he was accused of dissembling as to his real sentiments.—He wrote fourteen books of *Commentaries* on Paul's Epistles; (perhaps the very books published among the works of Jerome, and ascribed to that father;) also an Epistle to Demetrius, *de Virginitate*, A. D. 413; (falsely ascribed both to Jerome and to Augustine, and published as theirs;)—a *Confession of his Faith*, addressed to Innocent, bishop of Rome, A. D. 417. His last works are, *de Fide Trinitatis*, lib. iii. — *Λiber ἐδλογίων* sive *Testimoniorum*; (Collections from Scripture, in support of some doctrines;)—*de Libero Arbitrio*, lib. iv.—*de Natura Liber*; and several Epistles.—See Cave's *Historia Litteraria*, i. p. 381, &c. Tr.]

⁸ [Cælestius, of honourable birth, was a student at Rome when Pelagius arrived there. Embracing the views of his fellow islander, he accompanied him to Sicily in 408, and to Africa in 411, where he remained some years. In 412, he was accused before the bishop of Carthage for heresy, and condemned by a council there. He appealed to the bishop of Rome; but went to Ephesus, where he became a presbyter. He now disseminated his errors widely in Asia and the islands. In 416 he went to Constantinople, and the next year to Rome, when he so far satisfied Zosimus, as to obtain from him a recommendation to the bishops of Africa to restore him. But in 418 he was condemned by a synod at Rome,

an Irishman, both monks living at Rome, and in high reputation for their virtues and piety, considering the doctrines of Christians concerning man's innate vitiosity, and his need of divine grace within for the mind's illumination and amendment, as great impediments to the progress of holiness, and nurses of human carelessness, thought that they should be rooted out; they therefore taught that current opinions respecting a corruption of the human nature, derived to us from our first parents, were untrue; that the parents of the human race sinned only for themselves, and not for their posterity; that men are now born as pure and innocent as *Adam* was when God created him; that human beings therefore can, by their natural power, renovate themselves, and reach the highest degree of holiness; that man requires, indeed, external grace to call forth his efforts, but needs not heavenly grace within⁹. These doc-

and was banished from the empire by the emperor. He now concealed himself in the East. In 429 the emperor forbade his coming to Constantinople. In 430, a synod at Rome condemned him; and also the council of Ephesus in 431. From that time we hear no more of him. He wrote a confession of his faith, several Epistles, and some short pieces; but none of his works have reached us entire, except his Confession of faith, and perhaps some Epistles among those of Jerome. See Cave, *Historia Litteraria*, tom. i. p. 334, &c. Tr.]

⁹ According to Dr. Walch, (*Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. iv. p. 735, &c.) as abridged by Schlegel, the system of Pelagius was as follows. 1. Men, as they now come into the world, are, in respect to their powers and abilities, in the same state in which Adam was created. 2. Adam sinned; but his sinning harmed no one but himself. 3. Human nature, therefore, is not changed by the fall: and death is not a punishment for sin; but Adam would have died, had he not apostatized. For death is inseparable from our nature; and the same is true of the pains of childbirth, diseases, and outward evils, particularly in children. 4. Much less is the guilt of Adam's sin imputed to his offspring; for God would be unjust, if he imputed to us the actions of others. 5. Such imputations cannot be proved, by the fact, that Christ has redeemed infants: for this redemption is to be

understood of their heirship to the kingdom of heaven, from which, an heirship to another's guilt will not follow. 6. Neither does the baptism of infants prove such an imputation; for they thereby obtain the kingdom of heaven, which Christ has promised only to baptized persons. 7. When children die without baptism, they are not therefore damned. They are indeed excluded from the kingdom of heaven, but not from eternal blessedness. For the Pelagians held to a threefold state after death: damnation, for sinners; the kingdom of heaven, for baptized Christians who live a holy life, and for baptized children; and *eternal life*, for unbaptized children, and for unbaptized adults who live virtuous lives. 8. Much less is human nature *depraved*, in consequence of the fall of Adam. There is therefore no hereditary sin. 9. For though it may be granted that Adam is so far the author of sin, as he was the first that sinned, and by his example has seduced others, yet this is not to be understood of a *propagation* of sin by generation. 10. This supposed propagation of sin is the less admissible, because it would imply a *propagation of souls*, which is not true. 11. Neither can such a propagation be maintained without impeaching the justice of God, introducing unconditional necessity, and destroying our freedom. 12. It is true there are in men sinful propensities; in particular, the propensity for sexual intercourse;

trines, and such as are connected with them, the above-mentioned monks secretly disseminated at Rome. But in the year 410, on account of the invasion of the Goths, they retired from Rome, and going first to Sicily, and thence to Africa, they more openly advanced their opinions. From Africa, *Pelagius* went into Palestine; but *Celestius* continuing at Carthage, soli-

but these are not sins. 13. If sin were propagated by natural generation, and every motion of the sinful propensities, and every desire, therefore, were sinful, then the marriage state would be sinful. 14. As man has ability to sin, so has he also not only ability to discern what is good, but likewise power to desire it and to perform it. And this is the freedom of the will, which is so essential to man, that he cannot lose it. 15. The *grace*, which the Scriptures represent as the source of morally good actions in man, *Pelagius* understood to denote various things. For he understood the word (a) of the whole constitution of our nature, and especially of the endowment of *free will*: (b) of the promulgation of the divine law: (c) of the forgiveness of past sins, without any influence on the future conduct: (d) of the example of Christ's holy life, which he called the *grace of Christ*: (e) of the internal change in the understanding, whereby the truth is recognized; which he called *grace*, and also the *assistance* of the Holy Spirit: (f) and sometimes *grace* with him was equivalent to *baptism* and *blessedness*. 16. Man is as capable of securing salvation, by the proper use of his powers, as of drawing on himself damnation by the misuse of them. 17. And therefore God has given men a law; and this law prescribes nothing impossible. 18. God requires from men a perfect, personal obedience to his law. 19. Actions originating from ignorance or forgetfulness, are not sinful. 20. So also natural propensities, or the cravings of things sinful, is not of itself sinful. 21. Therefore perfect personal obedience to the law, on the part of men, is practicable, through the uncorruptness of the powers of nature. 22. And by *grace* (consisting in external divine aids, the right use of which depends on men's free will,) good works are performed. They did not deny all internal change in men by *grace*, but they confined it solely to

the *understanding*, and controverted all internal change of the *will*. They also limited the necessity of this *grace*, by maintaining that it was not indispensable to all men, and that it only *facilitated* the keeping of God's commandments. 23. This possibility of performing good works by the free use of our natural powers they endeavoured to prove, by the existence of virtuous persons among the pagans: and likewise, 24. from the saints mentioned in the Old Testament; whom they divided into two classes, the first, from Adam to Moses, who, like the pagans, had only natural *grace*; the second, from Moses to Christ, who had the *grace* of the law. Some of the saints who had the law, were all their lifetime without sin; others sinned indeed, but being converted they ceased to sin, and yielded a perfect obedience to the law. 25. The *grace*, whereby perfect obedience becomes possible, is a consequence of precedent good works: 26. and such obedience is absolutely necessary to salvation. 27. Sins, originating from a misuse of human freedom, and continued by imitation and by custom, were forgiven, under the Old Testament, solely on account of good works; and under the New Testament, through the *grace* of Christ. 28. Their idea of the way of salvation, then, was this. A man who has sinned converts himself; that is, he leaves off sinning, and this by his own powers. He believes on Christ; that is, he embraces his doctrines. He is now baptized; and on account of this baptism, all his previous sins are forgiven him, and he is without sin. He has the instructions and the example of Christ, whereby he is placed in a condition to render perfect obedience to the divine law. This he *can* do if he will; and he can either withstand all temptations, or fall from *grace*. 29. Moreover they admitted conditional decrees; the condition of which was either foreseen good works, or foreseen sin. *Tr.]*

cited a place among the presbyters of that city. His novel opinions, however, being detected, he was condemned in a council at Carthage A. D. 412, and leaving the country, he went to Asia. From this time *Augustine*, the famous bishop of Hippo, began to assail with his pen the doctrines of *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*: and to him chiefly is due the honour of suppressing this sect at its very birth¹.

§ 24. *Pelagius* was more fortunate in the East; for under the patronage of *John*, bishop of Jerusalem, who considered the doctrines of *Pelagius* as according with the opinions of *Origen*, to which *John* was attached, *Pelagius* freely professed his sentiments, and gathered disciples. And although he was impeached in the year 415, by *Orosius*, a Spanish presbyter, whom *Augustine* had sent into Palestine, yet a convention of bishops at Jerusalem dismissed him without censure; and a little after, in a council held at Diospolis in Palestine, he was acquitted of every crime and error². The controversy being

¹ The history of the Pelagians has been written by many persons: as by Ja. Ussher, in his *Antiquitat. Ecclesiæ Britan.*; Joh. a Laet, a Netherlander; Ger. Joh. Vossius; Hen. Noris; Jo. Garnier, in his *Supplement* to the works of Theodoret; Cornel. Jansen, in his *Augustinus*; and others. The French Jesuit, Jac. de Longueval, left a MS. *Historia Pelagiana*. See his Preface to the ninth vol. of his *History of the Gallican Church*, p. iv. But among so many writers, no one yet has exhausted the whole subject, or shown himself free from undue partiality. [This partiality is to be attributed to the renewal of these controversies. In all ages there have been some in the Christian church who coincided, either wholly or partially, with *Pelagius*, and who opposed the doctrine of *Augustine*. On the other hand, the scholastics adopted the greatest part of *Augustine's* sentiments. And these two parties have never been at rest. The affair with *Gotteschalvus*, and the contests between the Thomists and the Scotists, kept up these dissensions; and in the times of the reformation, such commotions were increased, when *Luther* and *Erasmus* came upon the arena, and the council of Trent made a considerable part of the *Pelagian* system to be articles of faith. From that period onward, the Protestants have maintained, that the

Romish church holds, not what *Augustine* taught, but what *Pelagius*, or at least the Semi-Pelagians, inculcated; and the Romish doctors endeavour to maintain the contrary. The Dominicans and the Jesuits, and also the Jesuits and Jansenists, have likewise moved controversies within their own church, respecting Pelagianism and the opinions of *Augustine*: and among the Protestants, the charge of Pelagianism has been brought against the Arminians, and likewise against various individual doctors. No wonder, therefore, if all these learned writers of the *Pelagian* history are often betrayed into errors by the prejudices of their party. *Schl.*—Dr. *Walch's* account is full and candid, *Historie der Ketzerzeu*, vol. iv. p. 519—846, and for the Semi-Pelagians, vol. v. p. 3—228. *Müncher's* statement of the opinions of the different parties is lucid and well vouched; *Dogmengeschichte*, vol. iv. p. 122—262. *Tr.*]

² See Gabr. Daniel, *Histoire du Concile de Diospolis*, among the shorter works of this eloquent and learned Jesuit, published, Paris, 1724, 3 vols. 4to, in tom. i. p. 635—671. [Our whole information respecting these councils is derived from the opposers of *Pelagius*, *Orosius*, *Augustine*, &c. The first was held at Jerusalem, in the month of July, 415. It was merely an assemblage of presbyters, with bi-

removed to Rome, *Zosimus*, (who was made pontiff in the year 417,) being taken in, partly by the ambiguous and apparently sound confession of faith, which *Cælestius* then residing at Rome offered, and partly by the flattering and insidious letters and protestations of *Pelagius*, pronounced sentence in favour of these monks, and decided, that wrong had been done to men who thought correctly, by their adversaries³. But the Africans, led on by *Augustine*, continued perseveringly to assail them with councils, books, and letters. *Zosimus*, therefore, being better informed, changed his opinion, and severely condemned those whom he had before extolled. Afterwards, that *Ephesine* council, which hurled its thunders against *Nestorius*, also condemned them; and now the Gauls, the Britons, and the Palestinians, by their councils, and the emperors, by their laws and penalties, crushed the sect in its commencement⁴.

§ 25. These unhappy contests produced, as is often the case, other dissensions equally hurtful. As *Augustine* did not at first state, with sufficient uniformity and clearness, his opinions respecting the divine grace necessary to salvation, and the decrees of God in regard to the future condition of individual men, he gave occasion to certain monks of Adrumetum and to some persons in Gaul to believe, that God has *predestinated the*

shop John for president. Pelagius and the council spoke Greek; but Orosius, the accuser, Latin only. This gave great advantage to Pelagius. Orosius stated what had been done in Africa: Pelagius said he had no concern with those councils. Orosius was called upon to make his charges specific against Pelagius. He then stated, that he had heard Pelagius affirm, that *a man may become sinless if he will*; and that it is *an easy thing to obey the law of God perfectly*. Pelagius explained, that he meant it should be understood, *with the aids of divine grace*. The council were satisfied with this explanation. The second council, which sat at Diospolis or Lydda, in December, 415, was composed of fourteen bishops. The accusers were two Gallic bishops, Heros and Lazarus, but neither of them was present. They sent in a long list of errors, which they said Pelagius and his followers had taught. Pelagius replied, that these were not *his* opinions, that he anathematized them, and that he believed what the Catholic

church had always held. With this the council were satisfied. But the sentence of the Africans still remained in force: and therefore Pelagius and Cælestius both sought the interference of the bishop of Rome. *Tr.*]

³ See Jo. Frick, *Zosimus in Clemente XI. redicivus*, Ulm. 1719, 4to, [and Bower, *Lives of the Popes* (Zosimus), vol. i. p. 334, &c. ed. Lond. 1749, 4to. *Tr.*]

⁴ See Ger. Jo. Vossius, *Historia Pelagiana*, lib. i. c. 55, p. 130. There are also some learned remarks on this controversy in the *Bibliothèque Italique*, tom. v. p. 74, &c. The writers on both sides are enumerated by Jo. Fr. Budeus, *Isagoge ad Theol.* tom. ii. p. 1071. W. Wall has likewise given a neat and learned, though imperfect, history of the Pelagian contest, in his *History of Infant Baptism*, vol. i. c. 13, [p. 192—282, ed. Lond. 1705,] which his learned translator (into Latin, J. L. Schlosser,) has enriched with excellent remarks.

wicked, not only to suffer eternal punishment, but also to commit sin, and to incur the guilt which will merit that punishment; and, of course, to believe, that both the good and the sinful actions of men were, from all eternity, divinely predetermined and fixed, by an inevitable necessity. These persons were called *Predestinarians*. Yet this doctrine did not spread far; for *Augustine* more clearly explained his views, and two councils, at Arles and Lyons, publicly rejected it⁵. There are, however, very learned men who deny that such a sect of *Predestinarians* ever had existence; and who maintain, that the followers of *Augustine*, while inculcating his doctrines truly and correctly, were undeservedly reproached by the Semi-Pelagians with these so great errors⁶.

⁵ See Ja. Sirmond, *Historia Predestinationum*, tom. iv. of his *Opp.* p. 271, &c. Ja. Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. liv. xii. cap. ii. p. 698: Dion. Petavius, *Dogmat. Theol.* tom. vi. p. 163. 174, &c. [According to W. Münscher, (*Dogmengeschichte*, vol. iv. p. 164, &c. 215, &c.) all the fathers, before Augustine, held to a conditional election; that is, an election founded on the foreseen good works of men. So Basil the Great, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostom, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Jerome. They likewise held, that Christ died for all men; and were strangers to the idea of an atonement made only for the elect. So Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Jerome. They also held, that the saints may, and do, fall from grace and perish. So Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, and Hilary. Even Augustine himself, in the earlier part of his ministry, held election to be conditional. But as early as the year 397, he discovered that such an election was inconsistent with man's entire dependence on grace for ability to perform good works; a doctrine which he held most firmly. He therefore advanced the new theory, that God's electing some to everlasting life, depended upon his mere good pleasure, in view of reasons known only to himself; that God from eternity predestinated some to repentance, faith, good works, and ultimately to salvation; while others he left to go on in sin, and perish everlastingly: that the number of the elect is fixed unalte-

rably and for ever: that this election of some to salvation through grace, while others are left without grace, and perish in their sins, is no injustice on the part of God; because all men deserve to be left in their sins. He denied that God really wills the salvation of all men; and he justified preaching the Gospel to all, on the ground that we know not who are elected and who are not.—When this theory was advanced by Augustine, it met with opposition; and it was not, by those who embraced it, always stated as guardedly as it was by its author. Hence, those opposed to it drew the frightful picture of it, which has been called *Predestinarianism*. This system, as stated by Dr. Münscher (*ibid.* p. 257), embraced the following positions; namely, that the wicked are predestinated, not only to punishment, but also to commit sin; that baptism does not remove all sin; that the godliness of the righteous does not profit them; nor will the wicked be damned on account of their sins; that in general, God will not judge men according to their deeds; that it is useless to address exhortations either to saints or sinners. Dr. Münscher subjoins: All these were consequences drawn from the doctrine of unconditional decrees taught by Augustine; but they were consequences which he expressly rejected. *Tr.*]

⁶ See Gilb. Manguin, *Fabula Predestinationum Confutata*; which he subjoined to a *Collection* of various authors, who wrote in the ninth century concerning predestination and grace,

§ 26. On the one hand, *John Cassianus*, a monk who came to Marseilles in Gaul from the East, and established a monas-

vol. ii. p. 447, &c. Paris, 1650, 4to. [Mauguin was a French statesman, who, with much theological and historical learning, maintained with the Jansenists, against the Jesuits, that there never were any *Predestinarians*. *Schl.*] Fred. Spanheim, *Introduct. ad Historiam Eccles.* in his *Opp.* tom. i. p. 993. Ja. Basnage. *Adnot. ad Prosperi Chronicon*, and *Prefat. ad Faustum Regiusen.* Hen. Canisius, *Lectio. Antiquar.* tom. i. p. 315. 348. The author of the *Life of Jo. Launoi*, in his *Works*, tom. iv. pt. ii. p. 343, namely, Granet, informs us, that Sirmond encouraged Launoi to undertake a refutation of Mauguin; but Launoi, having examined the subject, fell in with the opinions of Mauguin. [Father Sirmond was a champion against the Jesuits, who were charged by the Jansenists with departing from the opinions of Augustine; and he hoped to confute this charge, if he could only demonstrate, incontrovertibly, that there really was a sect of *Predestinarians* existing in the times of Augustine. Sirmond had published an ancient book at Paris, 1643, bearing the title: *Predestinatus, sive Predestinatorum Hæresis, et libri S. Augustini tenere adscripti refutatio*. The work consists of three books. The first contains a list of heresies; of which that of the *Predestinarians* is the nineteenth. The second book bears the superscription: *Liber secundus, sub nomine Augustini confectus, nonagesimam hæresin continens, quæ assertis, Dei predestinatione peccata committi*. The third book contains a refutation of the supposed tract of Augustine. This work is certainly ancient, and most probably to be ascribed to the younger Arnobius. But the credibility of its statements is much impaired by the fact, that its author was a Semi-Pelagian, and wrote more as a polemic than as a historian. *Schl.*]—This petty dispute, whether there was in ancient times a sect of *Predestinarians*, when thoroughly examined, will perhaps turn out to be a contest about terms. [To the question, whether there existed in the fifth and sixth centuries a sect of *Predestinarians*, some of the learned have answered *yes*, and others *no*. Those who answer in the latter manner, be-

lieve the sect of *Predestinarians* was a fiction of the Semi-Pelagians, who used this name in order to bring odium on Augustine and his followers. This opinion was embraced by the Jansenists, the Reformed, and among the Lutherans by Dr. Semler, in his *History of religious doctrines*, prefixed to the third volume of Baumgarten's *Polemie Theology*. Those who answer the question affirmatively, are divisible into two classes. They admit directly, that there were *Predestinarians*, who were condemned by the orthodox church; yet they deny that Augustine taught what they admit to have been the errors of this sect. Of this opinion were the Jesuits, and the early Lutheran divines.] Others, while they admit all this, add, that the opposers of the sect were principally Semi-Pelagians, who aimed to bring contempt on the Augustinian doctrine. They hold, that only a few individual persons, as a few monks of Adrametum, and Lucidus fell into these errors; and, therefore, they never constituted a distinct sect or heretical community. This opinion has been defended by Noris and Graveson among Romanists, by the two Basnages among the Reformed, and in the Lutheran church, by Pfaff, Buddeus, the elder Walch, and Dr. Bernhold, in a dissertation at Altdorf, 1737; and it is admitted by the younger Walch, in his *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. v. p. 280, &c. Among those who regard the whole question respecting the existence of a *Predestinarian* sect as a contest about words, besides Dr. Mosheim, may be reckoned Weismann, in his *Memorabil. Hist. Eccl.* tom. i. p. 410, &c. And, in fact, there is something like a contest about words, in the dispute whether there was really a *Predestinarian* sect. For very much depends on the definition of the word *sect* or *heresy*. If the term is used to denote a society of persons who have a particular mode of worship, then a *Predestinarian* sect never had existence. But if the term denote a set of religious opinions, embraced and defended by individual persons, here and there, but who never separated from the general church, then it may be said, there was a sect of *Predestinarians*. When we view the controversy in all its extent, we can by no means regard it as

tery there, together with some others, about the year 430, endeavoured to modify in some measure the system of *Augustine*⁷. Many persons falling into their views, the sect was produced, which its adversaries called that of the *Semi-Pelagians*. The sentiments of the *Semi-Pelagians* are represented differently, by those that oppose them. The greater part however represent them as holding, that men do not need *internal*,

a controversy about words. See Walch, *Hist. der Ketzereyen*, vol. v. p. 218—233. *Schl.*]

⁷ [The views of John Cassianus are exhibited in his *Collatio xiii. Patrum*, Opp. p. 491, &c.; and are well abridged by Dr. Münscher (*Doctrinengesch.* vol. iv. p. 246, &c.) as follows. As John Cassianus is the only writer of those times who has exhibited a connected view of the doctrines of the so called Massilians, from his works alone can the deviations of these teachers from the opinions of Augustine be derived. His primary object was, to exhibit the true worth and the necessity of divine grace, but without overthrowing the freedom of the human will. Man, said he, needs at all times divine aid; and he can do nothing to secure his salvation without it. But he must not be inactive on his part. All men have indeed original sin, and are subject to death; but a knowledge of God, and their free will, they have not lost. It can neither be maintained, that the commencement of what is good in us always originates from God, nor that it always originates from ourselves. Sometimes it is of God, who first excites good thoughts and purposes in us. But sometimes it is the man who takes the first step, and whom God then meets with his assistance. In either case, it is God who, when he sees the spark of goodness glimmering in the soul, or has himself lighted it up, by his own working, cherishes and sustains this spark. God's unchangeable will is, that all men may be saved; and when any one is lost, it is contrary to his designs. At all times, therefore, the grace of God is co-operating with our will, and strengthens and defends it; yet so, that he sometimes waits for, or requires from us, some efforts to choose what is good, that he may not seem to confer his gifts on the indolent and inactive. The grace of God, however, is always unmerited, as it bestows on the weak and worthless

efforts of men such valuable favours and such unfading glory. The ways in which God brings men to possess goodness, are manifold and incomprehensible; but he always treats each individual according to his character and desert. Yet this is not to be understood as if grace was imparted to each one according to his merits. On the contrary, the grace of God far transcends all human desert, and sometimes transcends the unbelief of men (*i. e.* brings the unbelieving to have faith). From these propositions, (which are arranged differently from what they are by the author, but are expressed in almost his own words,) it appears, that Cassian rejected unconditional election, the inability of man to do good, irresistible grace, and the Augustinian idea of the saints' perseverance. Dr. Münscher adds, that the principal point in which the Massilians departed from the adherents to Augustine, lay in this, that man has, in his freedom of will, some power to do good; by exerting which, he does not indeed *merit* the grace of God, yet he makes himself *fit* to receive it; and that God, in view of these human efforts, has determined to bestow his grace and eternal bliss.—The evidence by which the Massilians supported their opinions was various. Their chief argument was this, that in the Scriptures, faith and virtue are sometimes *required* of men, and sometimes represented as the gift of God; and these different passages cannot be reconciled, unless it be allowed that faith and virtue come principally from God; and yet that free will has some part in them. This doctrine, moreover, they said, coincided with the standing belief of the church; while the opposite doctrine was new, and also objectionable, because it annihilated human freedom, introduced an unavoidable necessity in human actions, and by holding up the idea that a man's own efforts were of no avail, encouraged men to remain inactive. *Tr.*]

preventing grace; but that every man can, by his natural powers, commence the renovation of his soul, and can have and exercise faith in *Christ*, and a purpose of living a holy life: yet that no man can advance and persevere in the begun course, unless he is constantly supported by divine assistance and grace. The disciples of *St. Augustine* in Gaul, contended warmly with this class of men: but they could not vanquish them^s. For, as their doctrines coincided with the modes of

^s Jas. Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. liv. xii. cap. i. *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. pref. p. ix. &c. Vossius, *Historia Pelagiana*, lib. vi. p. 538, &c. Irenæus Veronensis, i. e. Scipio Maffei, *de Hæresi Semi-pelagiana*, in the *Opuscula Scientifica* of Angel. Calogera, tom. xxix. p. 399, &c. [As soon as Augustine was informed, by Prosper and Hilary, of the existence of these opposers of his system at Marseilles, he wrote his two pieces designed to confute them, *de Prædestinatione Sanctorum Liber*, and *de Dono Perseverantiæ Liber*; both addressed to Prosper and Hilary. Soon afterwards, A.D. 430, Augustine died; and Prosper and Hilary carried on the controversy. In 431, they visited Rome, and obtained the patronage of Celestine the pontiff: but not succeeding by means of councils and popes, Prosper applied himself to writing against the errorists. His strictures on Cassian's 13th Collation, is a valuable performance. The *Libri ii. de Vocatione Gentium*, (i. e. on the universality of the call to embrace the Gospel salvation,) seems not to be his; for it does not come up fully to his views, as expressed in his reply to Cassian. Though it concedes more to the Semi-Pelagians than Augustine and Prosper did, still it was on the same side. The majority in France, as well as nearly all the Greeks, were in sentiment with the Semi-Pelagians. About the year 472, one Lucidus, a presbyter, having avowed pure Augustinianism, Faustus, bishop of Reiz in Gaul, wrote him a letter, and afterwards accused him before the council of Arles, A.D. 475. The council disapproved the sentiments of Lucidus, who retracted; and they encouraged Faustus to write his two books of *Libero Arbitrio*, in opposition to Augustine's views. A few months after, a synod at Lyons also decided in favour of Semi-Pelagian sentiments. But early in the following century,

Cæsarius of Arles came out a zealous Augustinian; and with the aid of some Scythian monks, and some others, he caused that doctrine to spread and to gain the ascendancy. The synods of Orange and Valence, A.D. 529, declared in favour of it. The opposers of Augustinianism were in that age denominated Pelagians, from their leaning towards the sentiments of Pelagius; also Massilians, from the residence of their principal writers at (Massilia) Marseilles. It was the school-men of after-ages who denominated them Semi-Pelagians.—According to Dr. Walsh, they admitted original sin; but probably confined its effects to our liability to temporal death. They supposed all the posterity of Adam have ability to discern what is right, and freedom of will to choose it: yet that none can be saved, but by grace, through Christ, by means of his blood and a Christian baptism; that Christ died for *all* men; that God wills the salvation of all, and therefore proffers his grace to all, so that all men *may* be saved, if they will. The way of salvation, they suppose, is, to believe, to practise virtue, and to persevere in it to the end. Faith is, believing that God has determined to save all that obey the Gospel. This faith originates altogether from our free will. From the same source, and from the use of our natural powers, originate the beginnings of a right temper, the desiring, seeking, and knocking. Yet neither this faith, nor these beginnings of a right temper, are *good works*; that is, they have no proper efficacy to merit the assistance of God, or that grace which is necessary to the performance of good works; and yet they may induce God to impart his grace. Thus it is God who gives the grace, by which faith is strengthened, and good works performed; yet its due influence must be allowed to free will, and not every thing be ascribed to grace. The connexion and co-operation of both are very neces-

thinking most in vogue, especially among the monks, were agreeable besides to authorities of the greatest weight, though chiefly Greek; and as neither *Augustine* himself, nor his friends, ventured utterly to reject and condemn them as pernicious and impious, no efforts could prevent them from spreading far and wide.

§ 27. From this period, therefore, begin those most thorny controversies, concerning the nature and the mode of that divine agency, or grace, which is necessary for our salvation; which have unhappily divided Christians in every subsequent age, and which are still protracted, to the grief of all the pious and good. Many in all ages have followed the system of *Augustine*, who ascribed every thing to the grace of God, and nothing to human sufficiency; yet have they differed in the manner of explaining this system. But a still greater number have agreed with *Cassian*, whose system, though differently explained, has spread from the schools of the Gallic monks over all the nations of Europe. The Greeks and the other orientals held the same views before *Cassian*; nor have they departed from them to this day. The opinions of *Pelagius* appeared to most persons too bold and loose, and therefore were never openly avowed by large numbers. Yet in every age some may be found, who ascribed to man, as it is said *Pelagius* did, full power, by his own strength, to keep the whole law of God.

sary, for grace only helps or assists. True faith may be lost; its retention depends solely on man's free will; and it is not true, that divine grace imparts to man a special gift of perseverance in goodness. God has a twofold decree respecting man's salvation; *first*, his general desire that all may be saved; and *secondly*, his design actually to save those who shall persevere in holiness to the end. Augustine's doctrine of predestination is very objectionable; it wholly subverts man's freedom; makes God the author of sin; and renders it vain to exhort sinners to repent, or saints to persevere in religion. Election to salvation is conditional, depending on the foreseen conduct of men in regard to obedience to the divine commands. To the puzzling question of their opposers, what becomes of so many baptized children, who die before they are competent to exert their free will; and of so many adults who

never were favoured with a knowledge of the Gospel; they replied, *first*, that baptized children, dying in infancy, are saved, on the ground that God foresaw they would persevere in religion if their lives had been prolonged; and *secondly*, that so many children as die without baptism, are deprived of that ordinance, and so many adults as are deprived of a knowledge of the Gospel, (both being doomed to damnation,) suffer these privations, because God foresaw, that the former would not live virtuously, and that the latter would not embrace the Gospel, if they had an opportunity. See Dr. Walch's ample account of this religious party, in his *Historie der Ketzerigen*, vol. v. p. 3—218. *Tr.*—When Augustine's authority upon such questions is brought forward, it should be recollected that his language is that of controversy. Had not an opponent found fuel for his natural heat, he would, probably, have rested upon lower ground. *Ed.*]

* POPES, OR BISHOPS OF ROME,

DURING THE FIRST FIVE CENTURIES.

	Accession.	Death.
	A. D.	A. D.
LINUS ¹	66	78
Anacletus, or Cletus ²	78	91
Clement	91	100
Evaristus	100	109
Alexander	109	119
Sixtus	119	128
Telesphorus	128	139

¹ St. Peter passes among Romanists for the first bishop of Rome, but the church there seems really to have been settled by that apostle in conjunction with St. Paul; and Linus appointed its bishop by their joint authority, probably, on their departure to evangelize other places. "*Nam Ireneus, a quo hanc Romane successionis tabulam primo accepimus, originem ejus clare a duobus Apostolis, SS. Petro et Paulo, arcessit. Sic enim ille, Θεμελιώσαντες οὖν, καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι Ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, διὰ τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρισαν. Fundantes igitur et instructes beati Apostoli ecclesiam, Lino episcopatum administrandæ ecclesie tradiderant; ut habet vetus Interpres, lib. iii. cap. 3. Quinam autem hi Apostoli fuerint, idem paulo ante indicat, dum dicit se non omnium ecclesiarum successiones enumerare velle, sed unius tantum, maxime et antiquissimæ, et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis Apostolis, Petro et Paulo,*

Romæ fundator, et constitutor ecclesiæ." (Bp. Pearson, *de Serie et Successione Primorum Romæ Episcoporum*. Lond. 1687, p. 28.) Epiphanius treats the apostles Peter and Paul as joint bishops of Rome, "*οἱ Ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι, ἰδὲν Apostoli et Episcopi.*" Thus, although the temporary supervision of St. Peter over the Roman church can hardly be controverted, his single, that is, proper episcopate there, labours under insurmountable difficulties, and it is more reasonable to consider Linus, the nominee of himself and St. Paul conjointly, as really the first bishop of Rome.

² Anacletus, or Anacletus, usually stands in the fourth place after Clement, and Cletus, in the second, after Linus; but the two names appear unquestionably to denote one prelate, who claims the second place, and whom de Valois reasonably conjectures to have been popularly-called Cletus. Pearson, 146.

	Accession.	Death.
	A. D.	A. D.
Hyginus.....	139	142
Pius	142	157
Anicetus.....	157	168
Soter ³	168	176
Eleutherius	176	192
Victor	192	201
Zephyrinus.....	201	218
Callistus.....	219	223
Urbanus.....	223	230
Pontianus	230	235
Anterus	235	236
Fabianus	236	250
Cornelius	251	252
Lucius	252	252
Stephen	253	257
Sixtus II.	257	258
Dionysius	259	269
Felix	269	274
Eutychianus	275	283
Caius	283	296
Marcellinus	296	304
Marcellus	308	310
Eusebius	310	310
Melchiades.....	311	314
Sylvester	314	335
Mark	336	336
Julius.....	337	352
Liberius	352	366
Damasus	366	384
Syricius	384	398
Anastasius	398	402
Innocent	402	417

³ The chronology exhibited here is that of Bower, in his *History of the Popes*. It was thought sufficiently accurate for ordinary reference, but Bp. Pearson, in his dissertation, *de Annis Primorum Romæ Episcoporum*, maintains, with his usual learning, a different system. He considers Linus to have been bishop from 65 to 67; Anencletus, from 67 to 69; Clement, from 69 to 83;

Evaristus, from 83 to 91; Alexander, from 91 to 101; Sixtus, or Xystus, from 101 to 111; Telesphorus, from 111 to 122; Hyginus, from 122 to 126; Pius, from 127 to 142; Anicetus, from 142 to 161; Soter, from 161 to 170. Dodwell contends that Pearson is mistaken as to Anicetus and Soter; the former having really died in 153, the latter in 162.

	Accession.	Death.
	A. D.	A. D.
Zosimus.....	417	418
Boniface	419	422
Celestine	422	432
Sixtus III.	432	410
Leo the Great	440	461
Hilarius	461	467
Simplicius	467	483
Felix II.	483	492
Gelasius	492	496
Anastasius II.	496	498
Symmachus	498	514

PRINCIPAL COUNCILS

DURING THE FIRST FIVE CENTURIES.

	A. D.
ILLIBERIS ¹	305
Arles	314
Ancyra	314
Neo-Cæsarea	314
Laodicea.....	320

¹ As it has been thought material only to note such councils as are of some prominence in ecclesiastical history, and have left canons upon record, that of Illiberis was first selected. Neither the place, nor the time in which it sat, has passed unquestioned. The former, however, it is generally believed, was at a city, once episcopal, but now wholly ruined, built on Mount Elvira, where its traces are still discernible, about seven miles from Granada, in Spain. The date adopted is that given in Labbé and Cessart's *Councils*; which have been followed for all the other dates.

By Romish authors, the series of councils is made to begin with the Apostles themselves, three being actually recorded in Scripture; viz. that in

which Matthias was elected in place of the traitor Judas; that in which the seven deacons were elected; and that which excused Gentile converts from observance of the ceremonial law. (Acts i. vi. xv.) Various notices in ecclesiastical history are made to supply a succession of others, but the first with all the regular appearances of a council is that of Illiberis or Elvira. This has also been rendered prominent by means of its thirty-sixth canon, which prohibits pictures in churches, lest objects of adoration should be found upon their walls. Protestants have naturally exulted in this ancient authority against Romish usage, while the Papal party has met it with embarrassment, and endeavoured to elude its force.

	A. D.
NICE (First)	325
Gangra	325
Antioch	341
Sardica	347
CONSTANTINOPLE	381
Carthage.....	397
Carthage.....	398
Toledo	400
Milevi.....	416
EPHESUS	431
CHALCEDON ²	451

² The capitals denote Œcumenical, or General Councils. In strict accuracy, perhaps, none such were ever holden: means of exhibiting, in a deliberative assembly, the universal voice of Christendom being, in fact, unattainable. But in the first four General Councils, as they are called, the Roman empire, which was far the largest and most enlightened portion of the Christian church, may be fairly considered as judicially deciding some of the most

important questions in theology. These four councils, accordingly, have been for ages the received standard of orthodoxy. Upon their decisions rest such views of Scriptural truth as guard a belief in the Holy Trinity. From them theologians have learned to define the Catholic faith, and neither Protestant nor Romanist questions their authority. A position so commanding can be taken by no other council.

END OF VOL. 1.



AUG 75

